

# THE KHILAFAT MOVEMENT

ABSTRACT OF  
THESIS SUBMITTED FOR  
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
IN  
POLITICAL SCIENCE

By  
Syed Mohd Riaz

Under the Supervision  
of  
Dr. Mohd. Hashim Kidwai  
Reader Department of Political Science



Department of Political Science  
ALIGARH MUSLIM UNIVERSITY,  
ALIGARH

1973

## A B S T R A C T

The first chapter of the thesis gives a brief history of the Khilafat. It has been pointed out that Islam is a social order embracing all the walks of human life and contains solution of the vexed problems facing humanity. When the Prophet reached Yathreb or Madina, he established a state which came into being as a result of baiat or social contract. Within the brief span of 10 years, the whole of Arabian peninsula came under its sway. This state was unique in very many respects. It was a theocentric, ideological and classless state. It levelled down all the existing class or caste distinctions and established the rule of law with God or Allah as sovereign. His laws contained in the Quran were enforced by the Prophet as the head of the Islamic state. There came into being a community of the faithful which was guided in all its actions by the will of God and had no material aims before it.

The constituent unit of the Islamic state was the tribe. War, foreign affairs, peace, over all supervision of administration and maintenance of law and order were the main functions of the central government while other functions were performed by the units. Non-Muslims enjoyed protection of their lives, property and also enjoyed

perfect religious freedom. They further enjoyed juridical autonomy i.e. their cases were decided by their co-religionists in accordance with the laws of their scripture. A distinctive feature of the state was that it was intensely democratic and the state machinery was very simple.

Another most remarkable feature of this state was its cosmopolitan character.

Abdiyat and Khilafat are the two basic principles of Islam. Abdiyat means complete victory over self, control over passions and service of humanity. Khilafat means that man has been created to act as the Khalifatullah or the vicegerant of God on earth thus man having been completely subdued of all his selfishness and conceit by acting through Abdiyat has been raised to the highest dignity as the vicegerant of God on the earth. Not only the prophet but his immediate four successors were the living examples of Abdiyat and Khilafat.

The Khilafat is the religious and temporal leadership of the Muslims and the Khalifa - the head of the Islamic state has to carry on the affairs of the state, has to defend and administer it. His authority is derived from the Muslim community. The Khilafat is thus synonymous with the Islamic state.

The Prophet was succeeded by his four most distinguished companions who are known as the Khulfa-i-Rashidin or the righteous Khalifas. They combined in themselves the headship of the state and the religious leadership of the Muslim community as Islam does not believe in the separation between Church and the state. Till the first half of the reign of Usman- the third Khalifa the Islamic state went on expanding both in area and population. The Prophet had not left any precise instructions about the mode of appointment of his successor. After his death, Abu Bakr his senior most companion had been elected as the Khalifa or the head of the Islamic state and he on his death bed had nominated Umar as his successor whose election was confirmed by the general baiat. Usman was elected from among the panels of six nominated by Umar while Ali was elected by the people of Madina on account of the prevailing conditions. Thus the principle of election decided the choice of Khalifa. The second principle which emerged was that Khilafat was not confirmed to any particular family. Another important principle which emerged during this period was that the Khalifa carried on the affairs of the state in consultation with the companions of the



noted  
Prophet/for the understanding of political problems  
and sagacity.

During the later half of the reign of Usman  
dissension went to divide the Muslims and led to  
assassination of Usman. Ali's reign was a reign of  
civil war and for the first time a political group  
known as the Kharjis appeared who fought Ali and went  
to the extent of denying the very existence of the  
state. The Shia - Sunni theories of Khilafat have also  
been discussed at length.

The assassination of Ali was followed by the accession  
of Muwaiyah to the Khilafat. This marked the beginning  
of a new era. The hereditary principle was introduced  
although the accession of every Khalifa had to be  
confirmed by the general baiat.

A distinctive feature of the Ummaiyyad Khilafat was that  
the state was now more of a Arab state as the Arabs  
enjoyed a position of ascendancy. The old simplicity of  
Khilafat Rashida was replaced by a magnificent royal court  
and the Government became more worldly. Landlordism or  
a sort of feudalism had been introduced and the Khilafat  
expanded.

The Ummaiyyad Khilafat was overthrown and the Abbasids - the descendents of Abbas the uncle of the Prophet succeeded the Ummaiyyads. This Khilafat lasted for about 5 centuries. A notable feature of this Khilafat was that while the authority of the Ummaiyyad Khalifa was accepted by the entire Muslim world while the authority of the Abbasid Khalifa was not acknowledged in Spain and Muslim Africa excepting Egypt while in the east independent dynasties arose which paid only nominal allegiance to the Abbasid Khalifa. Islamic world was thus politically broken up into many fragments yet the Abbasid Khalifa was accepted as the Khalifa by most of the Muslim rulers. The Abbasid Khilafat was under Persian or non Arab influence and the Arab no longer enjoyed the position of ascendancy. Un-Islamic ways of life appeared more.

The Abbasid Khilafat came to an end in the middle of the 13th Century on account of the Mongol invasion. The uncle of the last Abbasid Khalifa took refuge in Egypt where his Khilafat continued till 1517 although virtually the Khalifa was a protege of the Mamluke rulers of Egypt. With the conquest of Egypt by Sultan Saleem I, the Khilafat passed into the hands of ottomans and this

Khilafat lasted for about 400 years. This gave birth to the eastern question towards the close of the 18th century and this remained a burning question till the first world war. This meant the problem of filling up the vacuum created by the gradual disappearance of the ottoman Empire from Europe on account of its decline and decay. This also meant the position and future of the loosely designated Balkan states like greece, Serbia, Bulgaria, Montenegro and Rumania- all Christians who gradually emerged as rising nations. The problem of Black sea egress and there from ingress thereto, the command straits of Bosphorous and the Dardanelles- the two most important strategic waterways. This was related to the position of Russia in Europe, her natural impulse towards the Mediterranean, her repeated attempts to secure permanent access to the two straits and her relation to her co-religionists under the sway of the Ottoman Sultan - the Khalifa of this Muslim World. It also included the position of the Habsburg empire and finally the attitude of European powers in general and of England in particular.

Sultan Abdul Hamid II made the Khilafat a centre of Pan Islamic aspirations and made full use of his title in order to stir up sympathy in the Muslim world. His agents carried on the propaganda that it was the primary duty of the Khalifa to protect the Muslim wherever they might be. The way in which Turkey became involved called forth demonstration of sympathy from all Muslims. As a result of growing misgovernment, the young Turk movement became very strong by the beginning of the 20th Century. This movement stood for constitutional reforms, modernization and of efficient Government. In 1908 Abdul Hamid was deposed and the committee of union and progress - the organization of the Young Turks now began to rule the empire. It stood for Turkish nationalism and followed vigorously a policy of Turkification. This went to increase the existing hostility between the Turkish Government and their non-Turk subjects.

In the first world war Turkey sided with Germany and suffered a crushing defeat. Inspired and instigated by the British, the Arabs revolted against the Turks. A harsh peace treaty known as the Treaty of Sevres was imposed on Turkey. Under this Treaty Turkish empire had been dismembered. This was quite unacceptable to the Turkish

nationalists who under Mustafa Kamal refused to accept it and waged successful war against the Greeks who had been actively helped by the British. Mustafa Kamal's victory compelled the allied powers to revise the treaty of Sevres. By the treaty of Laussane Turkey recovered practically all her Anatolian territories. The Grand national Turkish assembly decided to abolish Sultanate and in its place established the Turkish Republic. In March 1924, this assembly abolished the Khilafat which was resented by Muslims all over the world especially the Indian Muslims. Thus came to an end- the Khilafat at the great institution of Islam which had kept the Muslims under one political centre.

In the second chapter, the genesis and birth of the Khilafat movement in India has been discussed. The Khilafat was an institution which combined in itself both the religious and temporal functions. The authority of the Khalifa was recognized even when he actually happened to be weak. Moghul emperors of India however did not recognize the claims of the ottoman Khalifa. It was in the 19th century after the end of the Moghul empire that the name of the ottoman Khalifa began to be mentioned in the mosque in Friday prayer sermons. Probably this was on this account that now only Turkey was the sole Muslim power which could be called independent.

Till the Berlin congress, the British Government continued to support Turkey the main reason of this policy was the fear of Russian expansion towards the Black sea which would have meant either the end of the ottoman empire or its conversion into a Vassal state of Russia and secondly this was also due to the fear that Russia would become a Mediterranean power and would also reach Persian Gulf as at that time Mesopotamia happened to be a Turkish Province and all this constituted a grave menace to the British commercial and imperialist interest in India. Finally the balance of power which had been the cardinal policy of the British would have been upset. Secondly since the Turkish Sultan was the religious leader of the Muslim world in his capacity as the Khalifa, the British Government always tried to respect the feelings of Indian Muslims in this regard. But when from towards the close of the 19th century Turkey came under the domination of Germany which became a great rival to the British empire, the British got alarmed and gave up their traditional policy of propping up Turkey. Now in the changed international situation they had the greater danger from Germany hence in the Turko-Greek War which took place in the closing year of the 19th century and the Tripoli

and Balkan wars which took place in 1911-12, Great Britain despite her Neutrality helped the invaders in very many ways. This hostility of Great Britain towards Turkey was responsible for radically changing the Muslim politics of India. Maulana Muhammad Ali Abul Kalam Azad through their papers strongly condemned the anti-Turkish policy of Great Britain. Now Aligarh school which stood for loyal co-operation lost its hold among Muslims and Muslim League changed its creed to the establishment of self Government suitable to India. The 'Comrade', 'Alhilal' and 'Zamindar' openly sympathised with the Turks. An organization known as the Khuddam-i-Kaba was established in Lucknow in 1912 to defend the holy places of Islam. This was on account of this apprehension that the defeat of Turkey in Tripoli or Balkan war would place these holy places under the rule of a non-Muslim power which was against the Islamic injunctions. The process of dismemberment of Turkey had started and these two wars i.e. Tripoli and Balkan had hastened this process. A medical mission under Dr. Ansari sponsored by Mohammed Ali had been sent to Turkey to attend to the wounded.

The hostile attitude of Great Britain towards Turkey went to alienate the Indian Muslims. The annulment of

Bengal partition also went to enrage the Muslims. Their trust in the British Government received a rude shock and this led to a shift in their traditional policy of sturdy loyalty advocated by Syed Ahmad Khan and his successors. This change in the attitude of Muslims brought them closer to the congress, however when first world war started Maulana Abdul Bari of Firangi Mahal appealed to the Turkish Sultan either to join the war on the side of the Great Britain or remain neutral. But the Sultan Khalifa declared Jihad and this placed the Muslims in an odd position as it was their religious duty to help the Khalifa. To avoid the possibility of desertion or rebellion by Muslim soldiers who constituted a very considerable position of the Indian army, the British Prime-minister and the Viceroy gave this assurance to the Muslims that their holy places would remain untouched and the prestige and position of the Khalifa would be maintained after the war was over. This went to pacify the Muslims and they rendered a lot of help both in men and money to the British Government. But the activities of the Ali Brothers, Maulana Azad and Mahmoodul Hasan- the Principal of Darul Aloom Deoband were considered too



dangerous for their pronounced Pro-Turkish sympathies. So the first three leaders were interned while Maulana Mahmoodul Hasan with his disciple Maulana Husain Ahmad Madni was sent to Malta in exile. The Muslim leaders considered the war between Turkey and Great Britain a misfortune. They wanted that the Jazirat-ul-Arab including Mesopotamia, Arabia, Syria and Palestine with all the holy places must always remain under the direct suzerainty of the Sultan. As late as in January 1918, Lloyd George had come out with this assurance that the British Government would not pursue any vindictive policy towards Turkey.

Unfortunately the British Government did not keep up these promises but imposed a very harsh and unjust treaty on Turkey alongwith other allied powers which virtually meant the dismemberment of the ottoman empire and also meant the possibility of the occupation of the holy places of Islam by non Muslim Power. So the all India Khilafat organization was formed in 1919 to defend the institution of Khilafat, the holy places of Islam and to fight for the integrity of the ottoman empire. The passing of Rowlatt act followed by Jallian Wala Bagh tragedy very much intensified the anti-British feelings among Indians.

Gandhi ji who had now become an all India leader championed the cause of Khilafat along with the Punjab wrong. A number of prominent Hindu leaders like Moti Lal Nehru, Madan Mohan Malviya and Swami Shardhanand fully supported the Khilafat cause and this went to complete the fraternization between Hindus and Muslims. The Muslims of India took steps to organize an anti-Government Khilafat movement to give an affective expression to their feelings against the dismemberment of the Ottoman empire. The Khilafat day was observed through out the country on Oct. 17, 1919. Another Conference was held in Delhi in Novemebr 1919, where Gandhiji proposed non-cooperation as a remedy if the Khilafat wrongs remained unrectified. It was followed by a joint Hindu-Muslim session of the Khilafat Conference presided over by Gandhiji who assured Muslims of unconditional Hindu support and justified the decision of the Conference not to participate in the Victory celebrations. He warned the Government that if justice was not done to the Muslims, they would be compelled to withdraw co-operation from it. The Amritsar session decided to send a representative Muslim deputation to England and America to plead the

Muslim case of Khilafat. It was also declared that if the British Government would not accept the Muslim demands the Muslims would be guided by the obligations imposed upon them by their faith. It also decided to raise a Khilafat fund.

The third chapter describes the progress of the Khilafat movement. The movement gained a great momentum by the release of Ali Brothers and the Hindu-Muslim Unity over Khilafat bore fruit in the shape of the adoption of non-co-operation programme. The treaty of Sevres was responsible of his policy of non-cooperation which had to be adopted by the Khilafatists. The view point of the Indian Muslims was put forward before the Viceroy by a representative Muslim deputation which included Hindu leaders like Gandhiji, Pt. Madan Mohan Malaviya and Swami Shardhanand. It emphasised the intensity of the Muslim sentiments and outlined the Muslim demands but the Viceroy came out with a non-committal reply which very much disappointed the Muslims. A number of Khilafat conferences were held throughout the country which supported the Muslim demand. The Bengal Khilafat conference was most important had the address of its President i.e., Maulana Abul Kalam Azad gave a full exposition of the Khilafat question and fully explained its religious importance.

The non-co-operation programme was launched which included renunciation of titles and honours, resignation from the membership of legislature, the abandonment of practice by members of legal profession, resignation from Government services, refusal to pay taxes and the boycott of foreign clothes and <sup>of</sup> all Government aided educational institutions.

Some zealous Muslims embarked upon a plan of Hijrat to Afghanistan as they could not live in India under the British because of the unjust peace treaty imposed on Turkey and because of the violation of solemn assurance. As many as 18,000 Muslims migrated to Afghanistan but this movement held as the Afghan Government could not afford to bear the burden of these refugees.

Numerous meetings were held demanding the recall of Indian troops from Muslim countries and the cancellation of the visit of Prince of Wales to India. It was also decided to raise a fund of Rupees one crore in the memory of Lokamanya Tilak to finance the non-co-operation movement (and this fund had been subscribed within the time limit) and to enroll volunteer corps of one crore men to carry on the various boycott programmes.

In July 1921, the all India Khilafat conference called upon the Muslim soldiers to resign as it was unlawful to serve the British on religious grounds and for this the Ali Brothers and Maulana Husain Ahmad Madni were arrested. By the end of 1921 most of the prominent leaders of the Khilafat and the congress excepting Gandhi were behind ~~behind~~ the prison bar as many as 30000 Indians were arrested. The repressive measures of the Government could not crush this movement. In the Moplah rebellion of Aug. 1921 acts of violence had been committed and a parallel Government/<sup>setup</sup> in Malabar. The Government sent troops to crush this rebellion and as many as 10,000 lost their lives. The visit of the Prince of Wales led to disturbance in Bombay, Calcutta, Patna and Allahabad. But these repressive measures failed to suppress this movement.

The fourth Chapter deals with the collapse of this great movement. The abrupt suspension of the civil disobedience movement by Gandhiji on account of the outbreak of violence at Chauri Chaura in Gorakhpur district proved to be a great set back to the Khilafat movement. It also received a jolt when Lord Reading sent strong note on the Khilafat question to the Home Government asking the Government to have a total revision of the

treaty of Sevres. He suggested evacuation of Constantinople, the recognition of Sultan's suzerainty over the holy places of Islam and the restoration of Ottoman Thrace including the city of Adrianople and Smyrna alongwith Anatolia. He warned of the serious consequences if no attempt was made to placate the Muslim opinion. Montague had to resign for authorising the publication of this document. This had a marked effect on the Khilafat movement. The Khilafat leaders in a bid to sustain the movement demanded

- (a) the restoration of Turkey the Turkish portion of the ottoman empire comprising Thrace with Adrianople, Constantinople and the whole of Anatolia including Smyrna with full sovereign rights without any financial, economic, military or naval control of any foreign power.
  - (b) The grant of full independence to the Arab Provinces
  - (c) Suzerainty of the Sultan over the holy places of Islam
- victories of Turkish nationalists under Mustafa Kamal over the Greeks very much pleased the Khilafatists and these victories plus the strong feelings of Indian Muslims forced the Allied powers especially the British Government to revise the peace treaty.

But the joy of the Khilafatists proved to be a short lived because the Grand National Assembly at the instance of Mustafa Kamal first decided to deprive the Khalifa of his temporal powers by proclaiming Turkey to be a Republic. Sultan Waheed Uddin was deposed and in his place a<sup>new</sup> Khalifa was elected. The Khilafat leaders resented the Khalifa's deprivation of temporal powers since these were the pre-requisite of the institution of Khilafat yet they justified the action of Mustafa Kamal for deposing Waheed Uddin who was a protege of the Allied powers. In July 1923 the treaty of Sevres was signed. There were demonstrations of rejoicings all over the country over the victories of Turks in which Hindus also participated.

The suspension of Civil disobedience movement and the out break of riots in Multan and Hugli widened the gulf between Hindus and Muslims. The Moplahs rising had also caused estrangement between Hindus and Muslims Swami Shardhanand who had been released from jail under mysterious circumstances raised the cry of Hinduism in danger and started the Shuddhi movement. With the signing of Laussane treaty which was acceptable to Turks

and the slackening of non-co-operation movement communal differences began to mount and now riots began to take place on the occasion of festivals in a number of cities.

The vigorous efforts on the part of Indian Muslims for the preservation of the Khilafat failed on account of its abolition by the Turks in 1924.

In the last chapter the significance of the Khilafat movement has been pointed out gave a new leadership to Indians which was drawn mostly from middle classes. This movement had a deep religious tinge hence it arose a keen interest in religion. From the political platform religious injunctions and sermons were given. It very much encouraged both Hindu and Muslim revivalism, most of its prominent leaders like Gandhiji, Ali Borthers, Abul Kalam Azad, Mahmood Husain and Abdul Bari all were intensely religious persons. This movement emphasised morality and simplicity. For the first time through this movement Indian people fought as one for Swaraj and for the defence of Khilafat a purely Muslim religious question. This movement kindled a fire for national freedom among the people. They no longer feared the awful



and mighty British Government and openly defied its authority. Under the influence of Gandhian Satyagraha and Ahimsa, they cheerfully suffered all hardships and repression which had been let loose by the mighty Government. This movement brought Hindus and Muslims together and was responsible for communal harmony and cordiality on account of this movement Indian people became intensely anti-British and communal organization became unpopular while the loyalist element almost became ineffective. The Swadeshi movement became very popular.

The great shortcoming of this movement was that it failed to take into account this fact that the Khilafat had become unpopular with the Turks who had always suffered a lot for supporting it. Now they were under the spell of nationalism so they decided to do away with the Khilafat. This movement also ignored the strong feelings of Arab nationalism which could not tolerate the ascendancy of non Arabs. The Hindu Muslim unity which this movement had forged proved to be shortlived and with the victories of the Turkish nationalists this began to evaporate and now Hindu-Muslim riots began to multiply which put an end to this unity. Now communal leadership had an upper hand in Indian politics.

This movement revolutionized Indian politics and converted the congress into real national organization. This was the unarmed rebellion in the history of the world and it was through this movement that the Gandhi's technique of Satyagraha and the principle of non violence became popular and it was this movement which established the supremacy of Gandhiji and under it started the Gandhian era in Indian politics.

\*\*\*\*\*



T1449

T1449



# THE KHILAFAT MOVEMENT

THESIS SUBMITTED FOR  
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
IN  
POLITICAL SCIENCE

By  
Syed Mohd Riaz

Under the Supervision  
of  
Dr. Mohd. Hashim Kidwai  
Reader Department of Political Science



Department of Political Science  
ALIGARH MUSLIM UNIVERSITY,  
ALIGARH

1973

## C O N T E N T S

### P R E F A C E

PAGE

~~(i) - (ii)~~

### C H A P T E R - I:

#### A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE KHILAFAT

The nature of the Islamic state - the institution of Khilafat and its origin-powers and functions of the Khalifa-Shia and Sunni theories of Khilafat- The Khilafat-i-Rashida- The ummaiyyad Khilafat (661-750 A.C.)- The Abbasid (750-1258 A.C.) at Baghdad- The Abbasid under the Mamlukes (1261-1517 A.C.) at Cairo-Ottoman Khilafat (1517-1924 A.C.).

1 - 58

### C H A P T E R - II:

#### THE GENESIS AND BIRTH OF THE KHILAFAT MOVEMENT

Establishment of Khuddama-e-Kaaba-the shift in Muslim politics in India-agitation against Rowlatt act - the role of Ali Brothers- the beginning of the Khilafat agitation and the Muslim unrest.

59-138

### C H A P T E R - III:

#### THE PROGRESS OF THE KHILAFAT MOVEMENT

Muslim deputation to the viceroy on Jan 19, 1920- The non- co-operation movement - the Mutaffiq Fatwa, Nov., 1920- the Moplah rebellion-civil disobedience movement.

139-219

## CHAPTER - IV:

### COLLAPSE OF THE KHILAFAT MOVEMENT

PAGE

Government of India's despatch to the Home Government and its effect upon the Khilafat movement-Victory of the Turks over Greece- Celebrations of Turkish Victories by Indian Muslims- The Laussane treaty - weakening of Hindu-Muslim Unity and out-break of Hindu Muslim riots-conclusion.

220-243

## CHAPTER - V:

### A REVIEW OF THE MOVEMENT

244-269

## B I B L I O G R A P H Y

270-289

P R E F A C E

In this thesis, a study has been made of the genesis of the Khilafat movement along with the resolutions passed by the Khilafat organization and the Congress, the proceedings of the Khilafat Conferences a gatherings and public statements made from 1919 to 1924 and its background. For the first time India witnessed a mass movement which revolutionized Indian politics and which nearly paralysed the British rule and on account of which for the first time India realised a new pride and dignity and discovered a sense of unity and inner strength. For the first and the last time, in a rare manifestation of unity and accord Hindus and Muslims pledged to drive out the common foe. An earnest attempt has been made to give in the succeeding pages a detailed, objective, systematic and analytical account of the great Khilafat movement along with the effects of Pan-Islamism on it. I have tried my best to be objective while giving an account of the events and refrained from making any such comment which is not supported by facts. The progress of the movement, its achievement and finally its failure have all been described and an assessment has been made of the significance of this movement and its effects on Indian freedom movement and Indian politics.

There is no dearth of material on this movement but most of it is in urdu. I have collected material from Maulana Azad Library, Muslim University Aligarh, Library of Jamia Millia Islamia Delhi, Khilafat House the Office of the Central Khilafat Committee (a defunct body) Bombay, National archives, New Delhi. Indian National Congress Library, New Delhi, National Library Calcutta, Agra University Library, Agra, Anjumana Mohammadia Library, Agra and many other places.

I do not find words to express my thanks to Dr. M.H. Kidwai, Reader Department of Political Science, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, under whose supervision this work has been taken. His ungrudging help enabled me to complete this thesis. I owe a lot to him.

I am specially thankful to Professor S.A.H. Haqqi, Head of the Department of Political Science, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, who has encouraged me to carry on this work. He has been a source of inspiration and great help to me.

I am also beholden to Dr. Shan Mohd. and S.N. Faridi for the assistance and valuable suggestions they have rendered to me in this work. While I am grateful to all those who have helped me, I take full responsibility for whatever errors and omissions may still remain in the study.

Syed Mohd Riaz  
SYED MOHD RIAZ



CHAPTER - I:

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE KHILAFAT

## A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE KHILAFAT

There is considerable authentic record about the history of various nations and their achievements. The area of Middle East, the ancient seat of culture and civilization and cradle of the most important religions of the World namely Judaism, Christianity and Islam has immensely contributed to the history of the World. In this historic part of the World many epoch-making events that went to change the entire course of the history of the World have taken place one such epoch making event was the rise of Islam. This religion (Islam) started from Arabia-one of the most important countries of this area.

"Arabia, - the birth place of Islam, is a large tract in the South West Asia. It is bounded on the North by the Syrian desert; on the East by the Persian Gulf; on the South by the Indian Ocean; and on the West by the Red sea. This vast region which embraces an area twice the size of France, is divided into several parts or provinces, differing more or less from each other in the character of their soil, their climate, and the appearance of the people!"<sup>1</sup>

---

1. Ameer Ali, Syed. A Short History of Saracens p.1.

To the North, lies the hilly portion, which in olden times was inhabited by the Edomites and the Midianites of the Hebrew Testament. Then comes Hijaz proper, containing the famous sacred city of Mecca - the birth place of the Prophet and having in it the Kabah the national pantheon. Since times immemorial came Arabs from different parts of the peninsula to this city perform pilgrimage. The city of Medina known as yathrib is also situated in <sup>Hijaz.</sup> Hijaz stretches from North to South between the Red Sea and the chain of mountains which runs down from the Isthmus of Suez to the Indian Ocean. The South West corner of the Peninsula is named Yamen. The low - lying lands of Hijaz and Yamen are called the Tihama, which name is some times given to the Southern part of Hijaz.<sup>1</sup>

This desert land has a hot climate, has little rain and barren soil. A study of its geography shows that it is land without any substantial or sufficient agricultural production.

In the pre-islamic period the population of this peninsula was not dense but the people of this land led a life full of taboos and superstitious.

---

1. Ameer Ali, Syed. A short History of Saracens p.p.1.2

They were half-civilized people and often followed the laws of the jungle. Particularism was too strong and prevented the establishment of a central authority or Government. Before the rise of Islam, no State existed which embraced the whole of the peninsula. There were a number of city states, small kingdoms and numerous tribes which were the units of Arab society. These tribes often fought with each other and thus there was a state of civil war. The Arabian peninsula was bordered on the North by the two mighty empires of the day - the Persian and the Byzantine or Eastern Roman Empires. Both these empires were utterly degenerate and were quite incapable of solving the problems of humanity or keeping the Arabian peninsula under them.

The State of affairs of Pre-Islamic World can be summed up in these words. "There is perhaps no period of history in which society was so universally in a state of demoralisation nor in which all the nations known to the Greeks and the Romans were so utterly destitute of energy and virtue as during the period which elapsed from the death of Jesus to the birth of Muhammad. The nemesis was bound to come and events which no human

sagacity could foresee, against which no political wisdom could contend, and which no philosopher can explain by attributing them to the dispensation of providence who exhibits in the history of the World the education of the whole human species, at last put an end to the existence of the Roman domination in the East.

The Arabs were noted for their gallantry, bravery and hospitality but they were not prepared to live under the authority of any Central Government and forego their natural freedom or any of its part. Consequently the Country was not politically united. The people of Arabia had sunk very low at the time of the birth of the Prophet. They were given to idolatry and believed in innumerable Gods and goddesses and were ignorant of the true principles of the Civic and Political life.

The Arab life was essentially a free, gay and unlicensed life of pleasure and frivolity; wine, women and war were the only three objects which claimed the love and devotion of the Arabs.<sup>1</sup>

Idol worship, ceaseless wars on very petty affairs, practice of polygamy, adultery and gambling more widely rampant. Politically and socially the Arabs were divided

---

1. Khuda Raksh, Islamic Civilization PP.156-57

into clans and tribes. Their chiefs were the rulers on account of their strength, seniority of age and courage. A crude form of commerce and trade also existed. This period can rightly be called the period of anarchy. But at the same time the important vehicle of communication that is their language - the Arabic language was fully developed. It was the common fashion to appreciate poetry and literary practice. In those days the Arabs were having the most popular renowned poets. It was in these condition that Muhammad - the Prophet appeared on the scene with his Divine and universal message. The Prophet was an Ummi or illiterate. The Divine revelations or Quranic revelations gave him a commanding position.

Muhammad took upon himself the task of regenerating such a degraded people. He preached before them a new religion, which swept away idolatry, moral and social corruption, delivered to them the message of faith in the absolute sway of one supreme God, established peace and brought about national solidarity in the land and welded the discordant elements of Arabia into a compact brotherhood. He had to guide not only their religious activity, but also their political destiny, as the religion which he preached made no distinction between religious and worldly life.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. Khuda Baksh; Muhammad, the Prophet of God. P.13.

The prophet not only organized the social and moral life of the people but he also undertook the task of organizing the community of the faithful into a state.

Thus the Islamic state came into being with the arrival of the prophet in yathrib where he had migrated from Mecca. During the period under review that is till 100 A.H., it went on expanding tremoundously both in size and population. It no longer remained an Arab state. On the one hand it had its vast frontiers in Moracco, Sindh and ports of Central Asia were its frontiers on the other, it had a population of several millions comprising different nations and nationalities of the world.

The Islamic state founded by the prophet discredited the theory of force as the basis of the state. In the days of the prophet it was based on the consent of the people which was in the form of the Baiat.

From the Islamic stand point fear of God more than anything played the most effective part in maintaining the Islamic state. It was the fear of God pre-eminently which restrained Muslims from all anti-social and irreligious activities in the days of the Prophet.

"The Nature of the State" The Islamic state established by the Prophet was an ideological state and was quite

different from other states which existed in the past and from modern states. It was theocentric. God was the Sovereign. He was the law giver. All laws appeared in His name. Taxes were imposed and administration was carried on in His name. The Prophet was merely the medium through whom His words were revealed<sup>1</sup>. The state was a kind by itself. It can not fit in with any of the modern classification of the state.

The state did not come into being to enslave and subjugate humanity nor to perpetuate the domination of any particular class by class but it came into being to uphold social justice disregarding differences of creeds and races and enforce righteous life. The prophet united different people in the fold of Islam to submit to the ideal unity of God which could unite diverse races and creeds.

To the priest-ridden, wealth-dominated world, divided into numerous warring races and nations, it gave a new set of values and offered liberation to mankind, particularly to the oppressed and the down trodden who had been kept under subjection by the exploiting rich and usurpers of political power.

---

1. The Quran:- 18:110.



All were subjects to the same laws and fulfilled the same duties. A sentiment of national unity and a consciousness of rights and duties towards one another such as had not been felt before pervaded throughout the realm of Islam.

To some extent the state presented the features of a federal state. The constituent tribes were autonomous units having very little of the encroachment of their powers by the Central Government. They were promised security against their enemies by it (the Central Government). Matters of Common concern such as war, peace and neutrality were functions of the Central Government. In these matters, the Prophet's decision was final.<sup>1</sup> Another remarkable feature of this state was that it established the rule of law and brought all its citizens under one uniform code of law. This was something unprecedented in the history of Arabia. It also put an end to tribal jealousies and rivalries and there came into being such a community which was guided in all its actions by the will of God and had no material aims or objects before it. The most distinctive feature was that Arabia had become politically one in a remarkable short period

---

1. The Prophet's Charters to the Jews of Medina  
Ibn Hisham II pp.16-17

of time and with the minimum of bloodshed. The economic problems were solved by making the payment of zakat obligatory on the rich who considered themselves simply as trustees of their wealth. The state established by the Prophet was a partyless, federal, ideological and theocentric-theocentric in the sense that God was the sovereign but it was not in any way priest-ridden..

Another distinctive feature of the Islamic state during the days of the Prophet was that it was intensely democratic and was a classless state. All had free access to the head of the state who sat in the mosque, received every one and attended to all state problems. The machinery of the Government was very simple. Tolerance or liberty of conscience, equality and justice were the distinctive features of Islamic state.

#### Khilafat and its origin:-

" The aim of a Muslim's life or a follower of Islam may be deduced from these two basic principles of Islam- Abdiat and Khilafat. In the first place Islam demands from its followers a perfect faith in an Eternal, Merciful and Benificent creator as involves a complete submission and total surrender of his ego or self. Abdiat means complete

victory over self, control over passions, humility, simplicity and service of humanity. It is a standing safeguard against all those human weakness which proceed from egoism and which inevitably leads not only individuals but even great nations to their fall." "But mere faith and belief, however devout and sincere is not enough, good action is an essential and integral part of the faith of a Muslim. In order to grasp the full significance of good action in Islam we should know man's destiny and mission in this world in pursuance of which he has opportunities which have been placed at his disposal by the Providence. The following verse of the Quran illustrates this:-

1. "And when your lord said to the Angels that He was going to make or place a vicegerent on the Earth"
2. "He, it is, who has made you vicegerent on the land ..... that He might try you by what He has give you?"<sup>2</sup>

This is the Principle of Khilafat according to which man has been created to act as Khalifatallah or the vicegerent of God on earth.

---

1. The Quran: 2:30
2. The Quran: 6:166

Thus man having been completely subdued of all his selfishness and conceit <sup>through</sup> acting the principle of Abdiat is raised to the highest rank and dignity as the vicegerent of God on the Earth.

Not only the life of the Holy Prophet was a living example of abdiat and khilafat but his successors also translated these principle into practice.

The origin of Khilafat may be sought in the character and institution of the semetic races which could not think of a ruler without religious sanctity.<sup>1</sup>

The word Khalifa is derived from the root Khalafa, to leave behind which in the legal sense came to mean a successor of the Prophet, an heir to his temporal and spiritual powers. In the eyes of the Muslim law the Khalifa, being a successor to the successors of the Prophet and the Amirul Momenin, is the only legal authority.

He has power and authority to bring about any political, legal or social reform subject to the injunctions and authority of the Quran.<sup>2</sup> He is to consult the doctors of Muslim law.

The most important feature of the life of the Holy Prophet was that he was the Prophet and the Head of the State,

1. Syed Mahmood: The Khilafat and England P.3.

2. Syed Mahmood: The Khilafat and England P.28.

a spiritual guide of his people as well as their temporal head.<sup>1</sup>

Before his death the Prophet ordered that the doors opening in the mosque should be closed with the exception of Abu Bakr's door and he further ordered that Abu Bakr ~~was~~ his closest friend and senior most companion should ~~have been appointed to lead~~ the congregation at public prayers ~~by the Prophet~~ in the last days of his life,<sup>2</sup> and ably this leadership of the prayers meant the leadership of the Muslim community as well as for in Islam the Church and the State are combined into one.

The Prophet's death in the year 11 A.H. seemed at first to destroy all that he had accomplished. The newly born Islamic state threatened to disintegrate.

From every side came the alarming news of disloyalty, apostasy and rebellion. The religious and political supremacy of Islam was contested by a large section of Arabs.<sup>3</sup>

The news of the death of the Prophet made the three false Prophets burst forth with redoubled violence. They had detached powerful tribes around them from their allegiance to Islam. Mecca and Medina alongwith Taif alone

- 
1. Maulana Mohammad Ali: Early Caliphate (Preface)
  2. Ibn Hisham 11/P.370
  3. Fh B.I. PP 103, 104

stood firm on account of the influence of the Quraish. Here and there only a few tribes maintained semblance of obedience but they were hardly discernable amidst the see-thing mass of rebellion. The Muslims were in a very critical position.<sup>1</sup>

Every where the conflict was strong. The Peninsula was on the war-path and had to be reconquered for Islam.

With the death of the Prophet, the question of a successor - a question of extra-ordinary magnitude arose. The need of a controlling hand was felt by all. The difficulty was to fix the principle on which the successor was to be appointed. The Quran was silent. The Prophet had neither nominated any successor nor had left any concrete or clear instruction regarding the exact method of succession.

Probably this silence was deliberate and quite in keeping with the elastic and dynamic nature of Islam. Had any rigid principle of election and succession been laid down it would have, in course of time, out grown its utility.

✓ When this question arose, the Ansar and Mahajirin the two sections of the Muslims of Medina or Yathrib put forward their respective claims for ascendancy, prestige and honour

---

1. Tabari PP 1848, 1871

that went with the high and sacred office of Khilafat. It is wrong to suppose that two sections in any way represented the different conflicting political parties. They represented only the tribal groups vying with each other for honour and sanctity that went with the headship of the Islamic State and not for any worldly or material gain. The Arabs were traditionally accustomed to family rule. The idea of authority apart from the frame work of the tribe was almost unintelligible to them.

Islam had assimilated the tribal system as the most convenient basis of organisation in many a field besides military one.

The Ansar based their claims on the services rendered by them to the cause of Islam by affording shelter to the Prophet and his companions and fighting battles for the triumph of Islam.<sup>1</sup> But they themselves, were sharply divided into the two rival tribes of Aus and Khazraj. They could not decide from which of them the Khalifat should be chosen.<sup>2</sup>

The Muhajirin based their claims on having belonged to the Quraysh and on having been in first to embrace Islam.<sup>3</sup>

Among them were the Hashimites - the Kinsmen of the Prophet who based their claims on their close relationship to the

---

1. Tabari 1 p.1838  
2. Ibid pp.1842-43.  
3. Tabari 1 pp.1840-41.

Prophet. They advocated the principle of blood relationship. Their choice fell on Ali- the son-in-law and cousin of the Prophet.<sup>1</sup>

The Ansar assembled at the Saqifa-i-Bani Saidah to choose for themselves a chief. The assembly had fixed its choice on Sad-Ibn-Ubada. But he could not command the obedience of the Ansar what to say of the entire Muslim community. The Quraish alone were the most influential and respected tribe in the whole of Arabia on account of their past history, intellectual superiority, social ~~position, guardianship of Kaba, genealogy and services~~ to Islam. They alone were in such a position that no Arab of whatever tribe was reluctant to show obedience to them?<sup>2</sup>

Then again the Ansar were sharply divided between the rival tribes of Aus and Khazraj. The tribe of Aus could not gladly accept the rule of Khazraj which had been its deadly enemy in the days immediately preceding Islam.<sup>3</sup>

The unity of Islam was at stake. On receiving the report of the elective conclave of the Ansar, Abu Bakr accompanied by Umar and Abu Ubaidah hastened to the Saqifa.

---

1. F.B. VII p.20

2. Ibn Hisham 11 p.373

3. Ibn Athir 1 pp. 241,242, 243, 244, 245,246,247, 248, 249, 250 and 251.



In answer to the claims, of the Ansar, Abu Bekr urged the claims of the Mahajirin by mentioning their merits as regards precedence in Islam, preservice in the hardships and the most painful persecutions at the hands of their own kith and kin in Mecca. He quoted the words of the Prophet that the Imamah or the leadership belonged to Quraish. He acknowledged the services of Ansar in generous terms but he counterbalanced their claims. His speech won over Bashir-Ibn-Sad of the Khazraj and most of the members of the tribes of Aus to his side.<sup>1</sup>

Umar proposed his name and struck his hand on his as a token of the allegiance which continued to the latest times as the sign and token of election and homage to the Khalifah's election.<sup>2</sup>

This theory first finds expression in the traditions of Prophet Mohammed to his intimate companions.<sup>3</sup>

The Sharah Maqasid, one of the best known books on Muslim theology, contains the following saying of Imam Razi, "The Khilafat is the religious and temporal leadership of Islam which can be bestowed upon any Musalman."

The word Khalifa used in the Quran on several occasion has been interpreted by Muslim jurists in the sense of head

1. F.B. VII p.22
2. Ibn Hisham 11 p.373
3. Arnold: The Caliphate p.11.

of the Islamic state. Other titles used as more or less synonymous with the Khalifa have been Imam, referring specially to supreme leadership in worship, Amir-ul-Momineen (Commander of the Faithful).<sup>1</sup>

Islam is a complete social and political system founded on theocracy and permeating and governing every human act and activity. The Khalifa implies temporal allegiance as well, because the Khalifa is the heir not only to the religious but also to the temporal power of the Prophet.<sup>2</sup>

The Khalifa, therefore, is the highest executive officer of the Islamic system. He, in a word, administers Islam and the contents of Islam are determined by the agreement of the Muslim people expressed immediately through the Ulema and ultimately if indirectly by the people.

The institution of the Khilafat is as old as Islam itself and it always carried with it a religious sanctity. It is interwoven with the very history of Islam and as such can not be separated from it. It must therefore remain very breath in the nostrils of the Islamic body as long as Islam persists.<sup>3</sup>

- 
1. Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences p.145.
  2. Eyed Mahmood: The Khilafat and England p.30.
  3. Ibid pp.31-27.

Conditions for holding Office:

The Khalifa is the guardian of the holy Shrines and should have enough to protect the Bait-Allah (Mecca) that is the reason why he is called Khadimal Harrmain-us-Sharifain (Servant of the holy Shrines<sup>1</sup>).

In accordance with the doctrines of Islamic faith, a Khalifa should have the following qualifications. He should be a Muslim, male, major in age of good character, free from physical and mental defects, leader of opinion and thought and should have dignity and position competent to enforce laws and protect the interest of Islam and do justice to the oppressed by dint of his knowledge, equality, competence and courage<sup>2</sup>.

- 
1. Syed Mahmood            Khilafat and England. p.23
  2. Marwardi. Al Alkamal Sultaniya, quoted in shorter Encyclopedia of Islam in the article of Khalifa pp 237-239.

Power and function of Khalifa.

In the personality of the Khalifa, the supreme and temporal and spiritual authority of Islam are linked together. In the capacity of the Imam, his functions are the maintenance of law to give effect to it.

The executive authority is vested in the Khalifa who is to exercise it in consultation with the Majlis-e-Shoorah. But the state possesses one characteristic feature that its executive head that is the Khalifa is to be elected for life. The Khalifa or the Head of the State does not possess absolute powers. He enjoys limited or restricted powers. He is simply the vice-gerent or the Khalifa of the Prophet and possess no special privileges or prerogatives.<sup>3</sup>

He has no power to interfere with the Shariat and the fundamental law, which he can, under no circumstances alter. Besides these religious duties the Khalifa also performs many political functions. He is the head of faithful all over the world and their Amir-ul-Momineen (Commander of the Faithfuls).

In this capacity he has to defend the religion, protect and extend the boundries of the Dar-al-Islam,

- 
1. Mirza Abdul Qadir Beg: Khilafat and Jaziratul Arab p.129
  2. Ameer Ali - Spirit of Islam. p.127
  3. Itm Sad 111/1 p.129.

punish wrong doers, makes provision of troops for guarding the frontiers and wages war (Jahad) against those who refuse to accept Islam or submit to Muslim rule. He also levies and collects taxes, gives salaries to his officials and pays personal attention to the details of Government.<sup>1</sup> The Khalifa does not occupy that status or position which the Roman Catholic church gave to the Holy Pope, that is to say, the Khalifa does not possess right to modify or annul any of the Quranic injunctions and fundamentals of Islam nor he has any right to declare the forbidden as unforbidden or the unforbidden as the forbidden. He is only empowered to execute the teachings of the Prophet and the propagation of his teachings.

No one had the right to criticize the religious order of the Holy Pope. But in Islam everybody has the right to criticize and disobey the order of Khalifa if they are not in accordance with the tradition of God and its Prophet.

#### Shia and Sunni Conception of Khalifat:

The majority of Muslim scholars and authorities support the institution of Khalifat. On account of political

---

1. Mawardi - Al Ali Kamus-Sultaniyah (ed. Enger)

The following broad principles emerged from Abu Bakr's election:-

That the conditions with regard to competence being fulfilled the Khilafat should go to the leader of the most influential section of the community. That the Quraish possessed such an influence was beyond controversy. Had any non Quraishite been elected as Khalifa, Arabia would have been the scene of a Civil War.<sup>1</sup> The hereditary descent of Kingly power did not find favour with the companions of the Prophet and it had no part in the election of the first Khalifa.

The authority of the Khalifa is derived from the Muslim community and the act of election is a veritable contract between him and the community.

The principle of free election by Ahlul Hal Wal I'qd or the pillars of the state and its confirmation by the general homage was also laid down for subsequent history of the Khilafat.<sup>2</sup>

Thus it is clear that Islam did not confine Khilafat to any particular family or race or any nation,<sup>3</sup> and the Islamic law imposes no tribal or racial restriction in the choice of an Imam.<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Ibn Hisham 11 p 373.

2.E.g. Abu Bakr was first elected by the Pillars of electors at the Saqifah and it was afterward confirmed by the general homage.- Ibn Sad 111/1 p. 129.

3. Mirza Abdul Qadir Beg:- Khilafat and Jaziratul Arab p.129.

4. Ameer Ali:- Spirit of Islam. p.127.

reasons, Muslim community was divided into two great sects of Shia's and Sunnis, who differed on the procedure of election or on the appointment of Khalifas. The Shias regarded Ali as the Khalifa <sup>i.e.</sup> ~~fasal~~ an immediate successor of the Prophet while the Sunnis hold Ali as the fourth Khalifa of the Islamic world and they give first place to the first three Khalifas named Abu Bakr, Umar and Usman. According to the Shias the spiritual heritage bequeathed by the Prophet devolved on Ali and his descendants by Fatima, the Prophet's daughter. They reject the doctrine of election and hold that 'Imamat descends by Divine appointment in the Apostolic line! <sup>1</sup>

The Sunnis do not believe in heritage or heredity principle and advocate the democratic fundamentals of Islam. They recognized the election of the predecessors of Ali as valid. They are called as Sunnis or Ahl-i-Sunnatwal-Jamat. This difference grew sharper later on when the Shias began to believe in Imamat instead of the Khilafat.

Another point of difference between the Shias and the Sunnis concept of Khilafat is that the Shias believe that Imam though Ghaleb (absent) is always present in the spirit. The expounders of the law and the ministers of the religion

---

\*. Shorter Encyclopaedia of Islam, Article on-Khilafat pp 237-239.

are his representatives on the earth, and even the secular chiefs represent him in the temporal affairs of the World. The Sunnis on the other hand insist that the Imam must be actually present in person to impart religious efficacy to the devotions of the Faithful and that where it is not possible for him to lead the prayers, he should be represented by persons possessing the necessary qualifications.<sup>1</sup>

In Islamic history the period in which after the death of the Prophet the four Khalifas ruled was known as the Khilafat-i-Rashida or the righteous Khilafat. The underlying significance being that the men who were chosen to steer the temporal work of Islam during this period were also models of righteousness and they led the Muslim community onward both temporarily and spiritually to the right path.

The Khilafat-i-Rashida or the early Khilafat was fully representative of the ideals of Islam. Abu Bakr was known as 'the truthful, Umar' the discriminator, Osman, the rich, and Ali' the lion!

In Hadith this period of thirty years is specifically called Khilafat or successorship to Holy Prophet, as distinguished from Mulk or the Worldly or temporal Kingdom of Islam which came after it.<sup>2</sup>

- 
1. Ameer Ali - The Spirit of Islam p.124.
  2. Mohammad Ali - Early Caliphate Preface



### ABU BAKR

The organisation of the Khilafat was begun by Abu Bakr and perfected by Umar. He reigned from 632 to 634 A.C. i.e. only for about two years; Umar who succeeded him ruled from 634 to 644 A.C. i.e. for ten years while Osman remained at the helm of affairs from 644 to 656 A.C. i.e. for 12 years; and the reign of the fourth Khalifa Ali lasted only from 656 to 661 A.C. i.e. for 5 years. The reign of these orthodox Khalifas continued only for a period of about thirty years and this period was full of eventful happenings.<sup>1</sup>

Abu Bakr's inaugural address fully illustrates the nature of the state and the position of its head- the Khalifa. According to it, he was an elected chief of the community. He was not merely its representative but also responsible to it for all his acts. Every one was entitled to receive justice at his hands. He was to be deposed if he went against the commands of the God and the Prophet. He was to treat all the citizens alike and promote a common life of piety.<sup>2</sup>

- 
1. Mohammad Ali: Early Caliphate pp 24,25.
  2. Tabari : pp 1845-1846.

Abu Bakr's first task was to reunite the rebellion tribes; and within six months, under the brilliant Generalship of Khalid Ibn-al-Walid, re-unification was complete. The momentum acquired in this internal struggles looked outward for new conquests.

The other most important achievement of Abu Bakr was the system of collecting Zakat in the central Treasury. Another most conspicuous contribution of Abu Bakr was the introduction, in all the affairs of state, of democratic system of taking counsel and arriving at decision by the majority of votes.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. Mohammad Ali - Early Caliphate pp 77-79.

UMAR

On his death bed, Abu Bakr nominated 'Umar' to the Khilafat. Before doing so, he consulted the distinguished companions of the Prophet<sup>1</sup>, who were the statesmen of his regime. This nomination was to be confirmed by the whole community. The general election was thus effected without demur or hesitation. Once again the principle of seniority decided the question as Umar was the eldest in age among the companions of the Prophet after Abu Bakr. From the election of these two Khalifas it becomes quite evident, and how completely foreign was the idea of hereditary Kingship to the Arabs.

The general community took the oath of allegiance<sup>2</sup>. Umar's election went to confirm the view that the mode of election of the head of the Islamic state was allowed to take any form in the existing circumstances of any particular time as seemed best conducive to securing the agreement of the whole community. The principle was laid down if the ruling Khalifa felt that there was any one of such outstanding merit as to be marked out for succession,

---

1. Ibn Sad 1/III p.142.

2. Ibn qutaibah: Al Imamah wa Siyasat p.33.

there was not any technical bar against his sparing the community the suspense that was bound to follow his (the ruling chief's) death.

In the time of Umar, a permanent body of the Councillor known as Majlis-i-Shoora existed. It was a larger body. It met in regular sessions. Eminent companions of the Prophet or the statesmen of the day viz. Osman, Ali Abdur Rahman Ibn 'Auf', Zubair, Talah, Muaz ibn Jahal, Ubaiy Ibn Kab and Zaid Ibn Thabit were its members.<sup>1</sup>

It met to consider and dispose of various political and administrative matters.<sup>2</sup> All governors or valis, commanders and high dignitaries of the State were appointed with its approval.

Usually the Khalifa accepted the advice of this body and thus to a large extent the Khalifa in Majlis-i-Shoora carried on the administration. Its members were selected by the Khalifa on account of their piety, knowledge of the Quran, understanding of political affairs, administrative capacity and wise Counsels.

The Council worked on the principle of division of labour. Thus during the reign of Abu Bakr, the administration of justice was entrusted to Umar. While work of correspondence

---

1. Kunz III p.134.

2. The question of the conquered lands were decided after consulting the Majlis-i-Shoora Abu Yusuf pp.14-15.

with foreign states was in the hands of Ali. No controversial matter was decided without consulting the Council.

A consultative body known as the Majlis-i-Am existed in the time of Umar which also happened to be larger body. It consisted of the distinguished Ansar, Mahajirin and other tribal chiefs. It disposed of matters of vital importance<sup>1</sup> so much stress was laid down on the Shoorā or consultation that Umar used to say that there was no Khilafat without consultation<sup>2</sup>

Umar is the real founder of Fiqah or the Islamic jurisprudence.<sup>3</sup> His interpretations and regulations can be covered in volumes.<sup>4</sup> For the first time permanent appointments of Qadhis or Judge with fixed salaries were made in the capital and other Provincial head quarters for the administration of justice<sup>5</sup> during his regime.

All were equal before the law including non-muslims, If a Muslim murdered a non-muslim citizen, he was put to death.<sup>6</sup>

- 
1. Fh. B. p.276
  2. Kunz III p. 139.
  3. Al Faruq II p.134, Izalah p.319 BU
  4. Izalah II p.84 Al Faruq II p.184.
  5. Ibn Qayyim pp.20,73,74. Abu Dardah was appointed as the Qadhi of Madina while Shuraih and Abu Musa were the Qadhi of M Kufa and Basra respectively. The Governors of Egypt was authorised to appoint the Chief Qadhi for his Province.
  6. Once a member of the tribe of Nail killed a christian of Hira. No partiality was shown to the murderer who was Muslim. He was handed over to the relations of murdered and was killed.

Non-Muslim enjoyed juridical autonomy. They had their separate courts with their co-religionists as their judges. Their cases were adjudicated in accordance with their personal laws.<sup>1</sup>

The Khalifa was the supreme court of appeals. Umar held its general and all state sessions at the time of Hajj<sup>2</sup>. The principles of the separation of power was in operation during the reigns of Umar and Osman. The judiciary was normally independent of the executive. With the exception of Egypt where Umar had entrusted the appointment of the Chief Qazi to the wali<sup>3</sup>, and the Chief Qazi functioned independently and no one complained of the interference on the part of the other.

Umar established a separate department of police for the maintenance of peace and order. The Chief of the department was known as the Sahib-ul-andath. He was also to perform the duties of a public censor. He had to inspect markets to prevent frauds of all kinds and stop the public sale of wine.

- 
1. Hameedullah-Muslim conduct of State p.131.
  2. Tabari - p.2680.
  3. Ibn Qutaybah I pp. 30,73,74.

OSMAN

Umar introduced the principle of nomination of the electors in matters of succession. When he was stabbed by Abu Lulu, he nominated the six distinguished companions of the Prophet as electors and limited the choice of his successors among this body. They were to select one of them as the new Khalifa. The decision was to be taken by a majority of vote. In case of tie, his son Abdullah was to arbitrate and the other members had to agree to it otherwise Abdur Rahman was to have a casting vote. The dissenting members of the Council were to be put to death in case the majority had made a choice<sup>1</sup>. Thus no division was tolerated. The rest of the community had to confirm the decision of the electors through the oath of allegiance. Umar thus elaborated the machinery for the choice of successor. For the guidance of the future generation it was laid down that the competent, virtuous and influential statesmen who were given the name of 'Ahlul-Hal-Wal-'Aqd' by the Muslim jurists were to make the choice and exercise their calm and considerate judgement. It was not to be

---

\*. Itn Saq 1/III p.245.

left to hectic election campaign. As there was no sectional or anyother sort of interests to be safeguarded in Islam, such a procedure was quite in consonance with the fabric of the Islamic polity. Umar scrupulously guarded against dividing the Muslim community into several factions each canvassing support for itself which was bound to follow if he had given the right to choose the Khalifa to the whole community. He took special care to exclude his son Abdullah from the electing body. He thus eliminated the hereditary principles.<sup>1</sup>

The electors retired into an adjoining chamber and began to discuss the whole question Umar had also ordered that the choice should not be delayed beyond the third day. Abdur Rahman took the most prominent part in the body of electors. He consulted the leading citizens. He forewent his own claims if the rest accepted his decision and all agreed to it. Now Osman and Ali remained in the field. Abdur Rahman asked Ali if he promised to abide by the Quran, the example of the Prophet and the precedents of Abu Bakr and Umar, Ali replied that he would act according

---

1. Ibn Sad 1/III p.245.



to the best of his knowledge and ability. The same question was put to Osman he answered unconditionally in the affirmative. Abdur Rahman swore allegiance to Osman and it was followed by the general homage. After it Osman ascended the pulpit and delivered his inaugural address.<sup>1</sup>

In Osman's election, too the idea of seniority contributed much towards securing the submission of Ali, with his succession the Umayyads began to have an upper hand in the affairs of the state.

The reign of Osman lasted for twelve years. The last six years of his reign were full of turmoil and conflicts.

The administrative machinery of the state set up by Umar continued to operate. But the strong hand of Umar was no more. Osman was a man of mild temperament. With the conquests of so many non-Arab territories, the non-Arab grew jealous of the Arabs. Among the Arabs, too, the old tribal jealousy which had been kept in check by the strong hand of Umar had begun to raise their head. Osman tried his best to control the situation but since he was a man of mild temperament and of advanced age he could not

---

1. Ibn qutaibah: Al Imamah was Siyasat p.33.

adopt effective and strong measures against mischief-mongers who were Persians and Jews were jealous of Islam at heart. They conspired to push forward their evil designs of destroying the political power of Islam by breaking the solidarity of Muslims. Un-Islamic ideas and thoughts ~~and feelings~~ of non-Arabs had begun to capture the imagination of the Muslims.

Most of the distinguished companions of the Prophet who were noted for piety, justice, truthfulness and honesty had died. Their successors did not possess these virtues and could not win the hearts of the non-Arabs.

The Government officials of Abu Bakr and Umar rendered implicit obedience to the Khalifa. They considered it their religious duty. But the officials in the time of Osman were not so pious and religious as to render implicit obedience to him. In order to get over this difficulty, Osman appointed his own kith and kin- the Umayyads to important posts. On account of the bond of blood, they were loyal to him. But this aroused the ill-feelings and jealousy of non-Umayyads especially the Hashmites who were their bitterest enemies.

In different parts of the Islamic state a number of political factions holding divergent views on the question of Khilafat sprang up. For the first time, political differences of the Muslims assumed the shape of organised rebellion and revolution. A new chapter of conflict was opened in the history of Islam. Uptil now, the Muslim political theories were derived exclusively from the Quran, the Hadith, the practices of the first two Khalifas and Ijma or the consensus of opinion of the companions of Prophet. But now theories which had nothing in common with the political theories of the orthodox Islam were exploded. Kufa, Basra and Egypt were the centres of revolutionary activities. Osman announced that he would give a public hearing to the grievances and complaints against Governors and governors of different Provinces were summoned but no one complained against them.<sup>1</sup>

In the next year, 1000 Egyptian rebels who championed the cause of Ali arrived in Medina and offered their oath of allegiance to him (Ali). But he refused to have anything to do with them. The rebels of Kufa and Basra also approached Zubair and Talha for the same purpose. They too refused. The rebels then besieged 'Osman's house. Osman

---

1. Tabari p.294+,2945.

promised to redress their grievances in consultation with the other companions of the Prophet. But the rebels soon returned to Medina on the pretext that Marwan-a relative of Osman had sent a forged letter to the Governor of Egypt asking him to put to death these rebels. Osman denied the knowledge of this letter. He was asked by these rebels to abdicate but he refused to comply with their wishes, water and food supplies were cut off and finally the rebels forcibly entered his house and assassinated him.<sup>1</sup> This cold blooded murder opened a new era of conflict in the World of Islam.

---

1. Tabari pp. 2956, 2957, 29560, 29561, 2994, 2997, and 3018  
III  
Ibn Athir/p 66; Ibn Sad I/III pp.51,52.

## ALI

After the assassination of Osman, Ali was elected as the new Khalifa. He assumed the title of Khalifa and began to act in the manner of the head of a firmly established government after the bai'at of the citizens of Medina. He was the fourth Khalifa of Islam after the Holy Prophet. He came of Beni Hashim which was considered the most respectably tribe among the Quraish.

With the advent of the reign of Ali, there opens a new chapter in the history of Islam. This <sup>was</sup> period of domestic dissensions within the house of Islam.<sup>1</sup>

Ali was noted for his wisdom and the best Counsel. The Prophet often consulted him. He was one of the Chief Counsellors of Abu Bakr. Umar did nothing without consulting him and valued his opinion most. He used to say, 'Had Ali not been there, Umar would have died.' He had

a vigorous spirit ~~and determination~~. He tried to maintain the integrity of the Khilafat and avert the schism which for a time threatened the very existence of Islam. But he did not succeed. Heavy odds were arrayed against him. The treachery of his own men was responsible

---

1. Mohammad Ali: Early Caliphate p.274.

for his failures. His reign was the reign of Civil War. He wanted to rule with piety, honesty, justice and strict impartiality. He wanted to put an end to the un-Islamic traditions and customs that had entered the Muslim society and wanted to run the administration on the orthodox line.<sup>1</sup> As a legist he occupies a very high position. He acted as a Qadhi in the time of the Prophet. He warned his collectors not to realise taxes harrasly. He paid special attention to the defence of the frontiers and erected a number of military contonments on the Syrian frontiers.

A section of Muslims headed by Aiysha - the one of the Prophet's wife, Talha and Zubair- two distinguished companions of the Prophet demanded who had assassinated Osman should be punished. Ali too wanted to punish the culprits but his difficulty was that there was no evidence and in its absnace it was not possible to punish the guilty. Moreover very many who were involved in the murder of Osman had joint Ali's camp. On this account, a battle of 'Jamal' took place in which Ali came out successful Talha and Zubair were killed.

---

1. E.g. He took some of the landed properties in Iraq which Osman had granted to Umaiyyads.

### FIGHT WITH MUAWIYAH

Ali had first to deal with the fanatics of his own camp or the dissidents who opposed him on religious grounds. Their cry was that there should be no oath of fealty by but to God alone the Mighty and glorious. They were the anarchists of the day in the sense that they denied the existence of the Head of the State. They were intensely fanatics and regarded both Ali and Muawiyah as apostates. They formulated their creed one short sentence "No judgement but the lord's alone". In vain Ali argued before them that they themselves forced the arbitration upon him. They raised the standard of revolt against him for he had done an act of blasphemy. They thought if they perished it would be for a righteous cause. Fanaticism and simplicity were their characteristic features. They assembled at Nehrawan. Their design was to occupy Medina and established a theocratic rule.

They committed horrible outrages in the country round about their camp and put to death Ali's messenger. He had to change his mind and chastise these seceders. At intervals, they gathered up their strength and assailed the Islamic state.

They were often beaten back. These fanatics formed a political sect of their own. They proved to be a thorn on the side of the Khilafat, although Ali had defeated them, they continued to exist. After the battle of Nehrawan, Ali marched against the Syrians who under the leadership of Muawiyah demanded the revenge of Osman's murder but when he reached Makkah his soldiers dropped off in small parties and did not turn up in spite of his exhortations and reproaches. He had to give up this expedition. Muawiyah was now the undisputed ruler of Syria. He was strong in the loyalty and affections of his soldiers. He had not to fight his own supporters as Ali had to do. Egypt was lost to Ali through the unwise policy of Mohammed - Ali's new Governor and Amr became its Governor as Muawiyah's lieutenant.<sup>1</sup>

#### THE ERA OF DIVIDED KHILAFAT

Ali's regime was one of continuous struggle. He had to face and quell down risings. His own partisans and followers were indifferent and disloyal to him. This was burden and mortification hard to bear.-----

---

1. Ibn Athir III pp.107-108, 143.  
Tabari p.3041.



The frequent repetitions of the desperate enterprises of the Kharjis had a disturbing effect on the capital and the Khilafat at large. Muawiyah also sent raiding parties to invade and plunder Ali's territories, exact the tolls from Bedouin tribes and force upon them allegiance to his Khilafat.

Accordingly an armistice was signed between him and Muawiyah by which both of them agreed to lay aside their arms, respect the territory of each other and maintain a friendly attitude and thus an era of the divided Khilafat ensued. To the Kharjis the cessation of war and a settled Government was the ruin of their hopes. After this truce, they felt that the ungodly Kingdom of the earth could be overthrown and the reign of righteousness could be established in their stead. Three of them conspired to kill the three oppressors of the faithful viz. Ali, Muawiyah and Amr-bin-As. They thought that by murdering them Islam would be served better and righteous rule would be established. Each was to dispose of his fellow as he presided at the morning service; on the appointed day the conspirator Ibn Muljim attacked Ali and severely wounded him.

Muawiyah too received injuries but he recovered. Amr was sick on that day hence he escaped. But Ali's wound proved fatal. He died. He was so true to the principle of election that he did not nominate his son Hassan to the Khilafat.<sup>1</sup>

With the death of Ali, the Khilafat-i-Rashida came to an end.

---

1. Ibn-Sad III p.24; Tabari 3457-58,3460. Ibn Athir III p.156.

THE UMMALYYAD DYNASTY (661 - 750 A.C.)

Hassen Ali's eldest son and successor abdicated in favour of Muawiyah on account of the treachery of the Iraqis- his supporters. Muawiyah was acknowledged as the supreme head of the Islamic world.

The rise of the Umayyad to the headship of the state marked the beginning of the Arab rule. The democratic spirit of the Khilafat-i-Rashida gave place to the rule of Arab aristocracy. The non-Arabs enjoyed an inferior position.

Muawiyah was a man of unusual administrative talents. He formed and developed a highly disciplined military force and an orderly Muslim society. He established his authority at the new capital Damascus in 661 A.C. and became the founder and the first Khalifa of Umayyad dynasty.

To his Arab biographers his supreme virtue was his hilm, which might be translated as fitness, that unusual ability to resort to force only when force was absolutely necessary and to use peaceful measures in all other instances.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. Hitti: The Arabs a short history p.59.

Some of the salient features of the Ummaiyyad dynasty were as follows:

The tribal jealousies that had been kept in check by the strong hands of Umar were revived with vigour under the Ummaiyyads.

The principle of hereditary/<sup>Succession</sup> introduced into the Khilafat's succession never thereafter to be abandoned. Muawiyah was the first Khalifa who introduced the institution of Kingship or Mulk.<sup>1</sup>

Each Khalifa during his own life time designated his successor, usually his eldest son. The principle of election was maintained in this form that the Khalifa procured the consent of his leading citizens to the heir apparent of his appointee. The Khalifa's function of religious leadership diminished greatly and devolved upon a rising group of men learned in the Quran and the traditions of the Prophet Mohammad.<sup>2</sup> There were in all fourteen Khalifas of this dynasty and this dynasty lasted from 661 to 750 A.C. for 89 years.

---

1. Yaqubi 11 p.257. Ibn Khaldun 'Muqaddamah'

2. Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences p.146.

Muawiyah was succeeded by his son Yazeed during whose life time the great martyrdom of Hussain the second son of Ali took place at Kerbala.

Khalifas Abdul Malik, Walid I and Hisham were the most illustrious rulers. They extended and strengthened the Muslim power. There is no other reign, not excepting that of Umar in which Islam so much expanded and consolidated. Walid I was the greatest and the most powerful rulers among all the Commanders of the faithful<sup>1</sup>. The Ummayyads were over thrown in 750 A.C. by the Abbasids.

#### THE ABBASID (750 - 1258 A.C.) at BAGDAD

Abbasids traced their descent from Abbas- the uncle of the Prophet.

The Khilafat after the downfall of Ummayyads passed on to the Abbasids in the year 750 A.C. which produced a galaxy of Khalifas - matchless in magnificance and unrivalled in bravery, and for five centuries each successive Khalifa was a member of this family.

---

1. Muir: The Caliphate, its rise, decline and fall p.360-61.

A feature of Abbasid Khilafat was that while the authority of the Umayyad Khalifat was accepted by the entire Muslim World, ~~from first to last, was coordinate~~ this was no longer true of Abbasids. The authority of the new dynasty was never acknowledged in Spain; and throughout Africa, excepting Egypt, it was but in intermitten and for the most part nominal; while in the East as time rolled on, independent dynasties arose. Islam was thus politically broken up into many fragments, not necessarily in any way dependent on the Khilafat, each with its own separate <sup>despite</sup> history. But/all this, the Abbasid remained the only dynasty that truly represented the proper Khilafat.<sup>1</sup>

Another notable feature of this Khilafat is the change which now came over the Arab people, and the attitude of the new dynasty towards them. There was more of Persian and non Arab influence. The most illustrious Khalifas were Khalifas Harun-ar-Rashid and Mamun-ar-Rashid in whose time Baghdad became world Centre of Prodigious wealth and a place of international significance.

---

1. Muir:- The Caliphate, its rise, decline and fall p.432-433.

The last Khalifa of the Abbasids dynasty was Mustasim Billah because during his period of reign the Mongols attacked Baghdad and reduced the culture, glory of power and progress to a shadow. Abdul Latif calls the Mongol erruption : a misfortune that reduces to insignificance all other misfortunes.<sup>1</sup> For two years the Sunni World felt keenly and in sorrow the want of spiritual World.

THE ABBASID KHILAFAT UNDER THE MAMLUKES 1261-1517 A.C.  
AT CAIRO.

From the ruin of Baghdad by the Mongols an uncle of the last Khalifa escaped and found refuge in Egypt, where he was hospitably received by the Mamluke Sultan of the day<sup>2</sup>

Balbars, the Mamluke ruler of Egypt felt the need of the recognition of his authority by the Khalifa, as the Mamlukes had usurped the throne of the infant rulers of the Ayyubid dynasty. Therefore Abdul Qasim Ahmad who had succeeded in making his escape from Mongol massacre was installed as Khalifa under the title of Al-Mustansir Billah

- 
1. Ameer Ali: A short history of Saracens pp.399-400.
  2. Zaki Ali : Islam in the World p.85.

and with his installation as Khalifa at Cairo began the period of Abbasid Khilafat under the Mamlukes.

In this way the descendants of the Abbasids one after another maintained the title of Khalifa for two centuries and a half. Then Egypt was conquered by the Turkish Sultan Salim I in the year 1517 A.C., who was the mightest Muslim Prince of the age. The last Abbasid Khalifa Al-Mutawakkil was compelled to transfer the Khilafat in the favour of Turkish conqueror- the ottomans.



OTTOMAN KHILAFAT (1517 - 1924)

The Khilafat was transferred to the ottoman Sultans who ruled over for about four hundred years. This led to the birth of the Eastern question in the closing years of the 18th century and this remained a burning question throughout the 19th century and till the first world war. This meant the problem of filling up the vacuum created by the gradual disappearance of the Turkish Empire from Europe, which was due to the decline and decay of the ottoman Empire. Putting aside the many difficult problems connected with the position of ottoman power in Asia and Africa, 'the Eastern Question' may be taken, for the purpose of the present survey, to include:

First and Primarily: The part played by the Ottoman Turks in the history of Europe since they first crossed the Hellespont in the middle of the fourteenth century;

Secondly: The position of the loosely designated Balkan states, which, like Greece, Serbia, Bulgaria, Montenegro and Romania, all over whelmingly christians gradually re-emerged as rising nations as the ottoman flood had subsided.

Thirdly: The problem of Black Sea; egress therefrom; ingress thereto; the command of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles, the two strategic water ways and, above all, the capital problem as to the possession of constantinople;

Foruthly: The position of Russia in Europe; her natural impulse towards the Mediterranean; her repeated attempts to secure permanent access to that sea by the narrow straits; her relation to her coreligionists under the sway of the Ottoman Sultan - the Khalifa of the Muslims World, more particularly to those of her own Slavonic nationality;

Fifthly: The position of the Habsburg Empire, and in particular its anxiety for access to the Aegean, and its relations, on the one hand, with the Southern Slavs in the annexed Provinces of Dalmatia, Bosnia, and the Herzegovina, as well as in the adjacent Kingdoms of Serbia and Montenegro; and, on the other hand, with the Romans of Transylvania and the Bukovina; and finally: The attitude of the European powers in general, and of England in particular, towards all.<sup>1</sup>

The ottomans emerged into the realm of authentic history in the thirteenth century. The first reliable mention of them is the Seljuk chronicle, where Ertogrul appeared as one of several Turkish Chieftains in the employment of the Seljuk Sultan. More legendary history represents the ottomans as first appearing as a band of nomads, warriors, and herdsmen, flying from the high lands of Central Asia before the fierce onset of the Moguls.

---

1. Marriot J.A.R.: The Eastern Question pp 2,3

The Seljuks established a powerful empire in Asia Minor in the course of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, by the thirteenth their power was manifestly in decay. To the Seljuk Empire there was no immediate successor. Ertogrul and his small band of followers established themselves, towards the middle of the thirteenth century, in the north-western corner of Asia Minor, in the plain between Brusa and Nicaea, with a 'Capital' at Yonishehr.<sup>1</sup>

To Ertogrul was succeeded in 1288 by his son Osman or Othman, from whom the tribe, destined to fame as the conquerors of Constantinople and inheritors of the Byzantine Empire, took their name. Osman extended his modest heritage partly at the expense of other Turkish Emirs but mainly at the expense of the Greek Empire in Asia Minor, and, upon the extinction of the Seljuk Empire, he assumed the title of Sultan.<sup>2</sup>

By far the most significant aspect apart from the territorial expansion of the empire, was the assumption of the Khilafat by the Sultan or the combination of religious leadership of the Muslim world with the headship

- 
1. Marriot J.A.R: Eastern Question pp 41,43.
  2. Marriot J.A.R: Eastern Question p.43.

of the Ottoman empire. For, as an acute critic has said,<sup>1</sup> it marked the supercession of the Byzantine or European ideal by the Asiatic in Osmanli policy, and introduced a phase of ottoman history which has reduced to our own time'.

The Khilafat and the Sultanate passed without dispute, thanks to the sanguinary precautions of Sultan Selim, to his only son Suleiman, known to European contemporaries as 'the Magnificent', to his own people as the 'law giver'.

In the reign and person of Suleiman the history of his nation reaches its climax; as warrior, as organizer, as legislator, as man he has had no superior, perhaps no equal, among the ottoman Turks. Physically, morally, and intellectually Suleiman was richly endowed: a man of great strength and stature; capable of enduring immense fatigue; frank, generous, amiable in character; indefatigably industrious; a capable administrator, and mean scholar. But despite his brilliant gifts, sedulously cultivated, the reign of Suleiman is, by general consent, taken to mark not only the zenith of ottoman greatness, but the beginnings, though at first hardly discernible, of decline.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. Marriot J.A.R. Eastern Question PP 86,87.

From constantinople the ottomans advancing to the conquest of the whole of the Eastern basin of the Mediterranean: the Aegean Islands, Syria, Egypt, and the northern coast of Africa. The zenith of their power was attained with remarkable rapidity. Before the end of the sixteenth century, it was already passed. The seeds of decay were indeed sown, even if they were not yet discernible, during the reign of Suleiman the Magnificent (1520-66). When the Sultan Suleiman passed away in 1566 the ottoman Empire had already reached and passed its meridian. In the seventeenth century the symptoms of decay are manifest. Sultan succeeds sultan, and as one brief reign gives place to another, the decadence of the ruling race becomes more and more obvious. Anarchy reigns in the capital, and corruption spreads from constantinople to the remotest corners of the Empire<sup>1</sup>.

There was an anti-Muslim conspiracy among the European powers as well as a strong inclination to push Islam out of the way where it seemed to interfere with schemes of commercial and Economic aggression, piece by piece, the Turkish Empire has been dismembered, and partitioned by the European powers<sup>2</sup>

---

1. Marriot J.A.R. Eastern Question pp 4,106.

2. Zaki Ali: Islam in the World pp. 88-89.

During the reign of Sultan Abdul Hamid II and his emissaries, who first made the Khilafat a centre of Pan-Islamic aspiration and made full use of the title in order to stir up sympathy/<sup>for him</sup> in Muslim lands. They laid emphasis upon the fact that Khilafat was a venerable institution, surrounded by great traditions and associated with a brilliant past and that it was the primary duty of the Khalifa to protect the Muslims wherever they might be. The wars in which Turkey became involved called forth demonstration of sympathy from all Islamic peoples. Even the christian powers acknowledged the claim of the Turkish Sultan as Khalifa of the Islamic world to exercise a certain jurisdiction over the Muslims in their dominions.<sup>1</sup>

At the end of the nineteenth century, Abdul Hamid launched his Pan-Islamic programme in order to save his empire from external attack, and from the growing nationalist democratic movement at home.

As a result of growing misgovernment and aggressive foreign intervention a party was gradually formed in the first decade of the present century among the younger Muslims in Turkey in favour of constitutional reforms, military officials

---

1. Hans Kohn: A history of Nationalism in the East pp.45-46.

and modernization, It was known as the party of 'Union and progress'. Its members were called the young Turks. It had its origin with Turks exiled abroad and chiefly living in Paris, and thence it began to permeate Turkey and find influential support in Constantinople. The revolutionary party had Macedonia as their base and Salonika as its head quarters.<sup>1</sup>

In 1908 the old Khalifa and his regime was overthrown by the 'young Turks' and Pan Islam had lapsed completely.

Abdul Hamid was deposed and in his place his brother Mohammed V was proclaimed the new Khalifa Sultan in 1909. The Committee of the union and progress became the master of Turkey. They wanted to maintain the uncontrolled domination of the Turks over the various peoples of their composite Empire, that is "Turkification". There increased the hostility between non Turk races and the young Turks Government. The young Turks stood for modernization or Europeanization and constitutional reforms but were not prepared to give up the domination of Turks or the policy of Turkification.

---

1. Lord Eversley: The Turkish Empire, abridged by Sheikh A. Rashid p.129.

And it so happened that even in the last struggle for her existence,<sup>i. e.</sup> in the first World War of 1914 to 1918. Turkey was involved in a War in which Britain fought side by side with Russia which had been the old enemy of ottoman Empire. Nor can anybody deny that England has profited the most, not only by the destruction of the Ottoman Empire, but by the whole dissolution of Islamdom. The whole Empire of Britain in the East has been built up on the ruins of Islamic Empires and states in Asia and Africa both. Since the Balkan States, by 19th Century become independent, formed a union of their own and declared war upon Turkey in 1912, the Turks had been almost continuously engaged in fighting. Even rich and resourceful powers found their finances ruined only after four year's war. The poor Turks had to fight about a score of years and unfortunately they were engaged in losing battles in all recent wars - the Tripoli War, Balkan War, and the Great War, until Mustafa Kamal turned by his marvellous military genius the last defeat into victory.<sup>1</sup>

By the Treaty of Sevres which was signed in 1920, most of Turkey's possessions were taken away and she was also subjected to crushing debts and organized foreign

---

1. Kidwai Sheikh Mushir Husain: Pan Islamism and Bolshevism pp 85-113.



control. But the Nationalist party headed by Kamal Pasha refused to accept this treaty. The Greeks, with the approval of the British Government, sought to suppress the militant nationalism of the Turks. But they were badly beaten by Kamal Pasha and driven out of Smyrna. Kamal's victories compelled the Allies to revise the Treaty of Sevres. By the Treaty of Lausanne, signed in 1923, Turkey recovered a good deal of her Anatolian territory of which the Treaty of Sevres had sought to deprive her.<sup>1</sup>

Mustafa Kamal was himself a good general who had faced many dangers with his army at the risk of his own life for the sake of his country. He proved to be the Saviour of his country. He was a forceful speaker and a skilful organizer. His glorious victory at Sakaria will remain memorable in history for ever as one of those victories which have changed the destinies of nations.

On 1st November 1922 the Grand National Assembly at Angora issued an edict that the office of Sultan had ceased to exist, and that the office of Khalifa should henceforward be filled by election from among the Princes of the House of Osman.

---

1. Wortham: Mustafa Kamal of Turkey, p.80.

In brief, constantinople was to be 'vaticanized'. On 4th November, 1922, Rafat Pasha took over the administration of constantinople in the name of Angora Government; on the same day, the Grand Vizier, Tewfik Pasha, resigned and on the 17th the last of the Ottoman Sultans left constantinople on board a British Warship.

In 1923 Mustafa Kemal the ruler of Turkey, abolished the Sultanate and Proclaimed Turkey a Republic, but he retained the office of Khalifa out of deference to the religious susceptibilities of the people. It was, however, enacted that the responsibilities of the office of Khilafat would in future be purely spiritual. On the flight of Sultan Waheed Uddin, the Khilafat was vested in Abdul Majid. But when certain leading Indian Muslims addressed a letter to the new Government pleading that the Khalifa should be accorded better treatment than he was receiving, Mustafa Kemal seized upon the incident as an excuse for abolishing the Khilafat on the ground that its existence would lead to foreign interference in Turkish affairs.

In March 1924 the institution of Khilafat itself was abolished by the Grand National Assembly, and the Khalifa with his family was sent into exile.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. Marriot J.A.R:- The Eastern question p.352.

The abolition of the Khilafat caused a great deal of resentment in the Muslim World. The Indian Central Khilafat Committee had <sup>been</sup> informed that "The Khalifa has been deposed ..... and the Khilafat is abolished," In the reply cabled by the Central Khilafat Committee to Angora it is said, The news so far received has caused a deep distress and consternation among Indian Muslim Brethren they are deeply concerned with the question of the retention or the abolition of the office of Khilafat itself which is the very essence of Islamic faith and was designed to maintain and conserve the ideal Islamic brotherhood through a definite and well established institution."

Similarly, many other Muslim leaders of eminence condemned this action of the Turks in severe terms. The right Honourable Syed Amir Ali described it as " a disaster for civilization.<sup>1</sup>"

Thus ended the great institution of the Khilafat which had kept the Muslims politically one.

---

1. Hon'ble - Shibzada Aftab Ahmad Khan:- Aligarh Institute Gazette 19th March, 1924.

CHAPTER - II:

THE GENESIS AND BIRTH OF THE KHILAFAT MOVEMENT

The genesis and birth of the Khilafat movement

The Khilafat movement did not start all of a sudden on the Indian Political scene. Indian Muslims had close links with the institution of Khilafat for the last 1200 years. The earliest Muslim invaders of India were not the Turks but the Arabs who had started from their country after the death of the Prophet to spread their faith. Their virility and vigour, the democratic doctrines of their faith which it preached enabled them to become master of Syria, Palestine, Egypt Persia, and parts of Central Asia within a short space of twenty years. The conquest of Persia made them think of their expansion eastward. The richness and fertility further attracted them was the additional reason of their interest in the country.

During the reigns of the Khilafat of Umar, Uman, Ali and Muawiyah several attempts were made by the Arabs to conquer the kingdom of Sind, but the Muslims did not meet with any appreciable success in any of them.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. R.C. Majumdar: The Classical Age, p.167.

It was Mohammad Bin Qasim, Governor of Mekran, harassed by the predatory tribes who inhabited the country between Sind and Beluchistan, <sup>who</sup> led an expedition into India, which ended in the annexation of Sind, Multan, and part of the Punjab as far as the Deas<sup>1</sup> - to the <sup>Khilafat.</sup> Umaiyad/ the main work of conquest was taken up two centuries later by the Seljuk Turks, who poured into India from the land of their birth place in Central Asia in ever-increasing numbers. Finally the Abbasides succeeded in overthrowing the Umaiyyads. With the fall of Umaiyyads, the indivisibility of Khilafat ceased. Never after was a Khalifa acknowledged as <sup>real sovereign</sup> the/over the whole Islamic World. The truly Arab period in the history of Islam ended.

The Khilafat was no longer the sole spiritual guide of the Islamic World, and the sphere of its authority was narrowed by the independent dynasties that had sprung up in the various parts of the Muslim world. The Arabs had lost their old vigour and military zeal; and had now sunk quarrelling among themselves, always placing personal or tribal interest above the interests of Islam.

---

1. Ameer Ali Syed; A Short history of Saracens p.104.

The Abbasides accelerated the process of decadence further by systematically excluding the Arabs from office of the state. The old Arab aristocracy was replaced by a new class of officials and the entire administration was Persianised. Persian officials carried on the work and the central government grew weaker and weaker. The provincial Governors showed a tendency towards independence. The Turkish guards whom the Khalifa employed to protect their persons, were a barbarian race, and they soon relegated the Arab chiefs to the background and dominated their masters. So great had become their power that the Khalifa became a mere tool in their hands, and the Arabs fell from their high status. Mighty monarchs of the Delhi sultanate period like Iltutmish, Balban, Mohammad Bin Tughlaq and Firoz Tughlaq paid only nominal homage or allegiance to the Khalifa, mentioned his name in the Khutbah on Friday prayers and on their currencies and declared themselves his subordinates and vassals. The Khalifat was looked upon as the Supreme and Sovereign Muslim State on the earth and the Khalifa was its Supreme and temporal head.

All the Mughal emperors of India, without any exception, from 1526 to 1857, regarded themselves as independent rulers and refused to recognize the authority or claims of the Khilafat, which was at that time in the hands of the Ottoman Sultans. The Mughals were rather jealous of the Ottomans and on all the pulpits of the mosques of their empire they got themselves styled as Amir-ul-Mominin.<sup>1</sup>

They recognized no Khalifa or spiritual superior outside India. In the early 19th century after the complete collapse of the Mughal power the name of Turkish Sultan began to be mentioned in Indian mosques. As a matter of fact the loyalty to the Khilafa was revived by Wahabis whose struggle had undoubtedly a religious background.

After the death of Aurangzeb India had fallen a prey to the adventures of not only the Jats and Marhattas but practically of every race and sect. The British, who had secured a foot-hold in the country as traders, and had gradually established their commercial centres in various centres of the country. They soon began to meddle in politics and side with one or the other of the contending rulers<sup>2</sup>

- 
1. Asif Mohammad Qandhari: Tarikh-i-Akbar Jahi, p. 394.
  2. Mohammad Waziri: Muslim India, pp. 13-14.



and finally, succeeded in establishing an empire which dates back to 1765 when they got the Diwani right over Bengal they then began to crush the Muslims and non-Muslims rulers. Economic exploitation of the country, military conquest, political subjugation missionary propaganda and the educational policy of the English were all calculated to crush the power and undermine the influence and prestige of the Muslims in India.

The educational policy of the East India Company adversely affected the Muslims, not only by indirectly increasing the number of illiterates among them, but also by closing the doors of employment before them.<sup>1</sup>

The status and future of the Ottoman empire profoundly influenced the British foreign policy. When the Ottoman Empire passed under the influence of Imperial Germany towards the close of the 19th Century, the British Government gave up its traditional policy of propping up Turkey. Before that the British Government was very much sympathetic to Turkey and always propped it. The main reason of this policy was the fear of Russian expansion towards the Black Sea which would have meant either the end of the Ottoman empire or its conversion into a puppet state of Russia and secondly the fear of Russia becoming a power in the Mediterranean and in the Persian Gulf for

---

<sup>1</sup> Mohammad Noman: Muslim India, pp.16-17.

in those days Mesopotamia happened to be a Turkish Province and thus both the British trade and commerce and the Indian empire would have been in danger. Finally the balance of power in Europe which had been the cardinal policy of Great Britain would have been very much<sup>upset.</sup>/

, Great Britain was interested in the preservation of the integrity of the Turkish Empire on account of the fear of the blockade of the most important route to India by the possible access of Russia to Constantinople.<sup>1</sup>/

The Turkish question was intimately connected with the Indian Problem. The Sultan was looked upon by the Indian Muslims as their religious leader in his capacity of the Khalifa. It is true that he was accepted as such by the Sunnis only; but in practice he had sympathy of the non-Sunni Muslims as well for the Khalifa was not only the religious leader but also the ruler of the only existing powerful Muslim state.<sup>2</sup>

✓ Throughout most of the eighteenth and nineteenth century, Britain had appeared in the role of guardian of the Turkish Empire. <sup>had</sup> and/earned Muslim gratitude by defending the Sultan of Turkey from designs of European

- 
1. J.A.R. Marriot: The Eastern question, p.161.
  2. K.K. Aziz: Britain and Muslim India.

powers specially the Russian. Not only this, but actually ~~need~~ the British tried to mobilise the Khilafat's influence on Indian Muslims for their own benefit.<sup>1</sup>

When Abdul Hamid II occupied the throne, his plan and policy of Pan Islamism had a wonderful influence, as it was intended to have, upon the centrifugal tendencies of the various races, who, united by little but the common faith of Islam, compose the large and unruly heritage of the Sultan of Constantinople.

From the mosque of Mohammad the conqueror, from the palace of Yildiz, the wily despot on the throne sent out to all parts of the Muslim world, far beyond the actual dominions of the Ottoman Sultanate, constant files and troops of Priests and missionaries, to bear to the most distant regions the message to all true believers to knit closer the bonds of brotherhood and to be one people in defence of the Faith.

And it was the perpetual policy of the Sultan Abdul Hamid to bind the Arabs and Albanians to his throne and banner by every device. ~~and every privilege~~ His great plan of the Hedjaz Railway to the Holy places could only

---

1. M.H. Abbas: All about the Khilafat, pp.28,61,62.

be brought within measurable distance of completion by a policy of the most profound and ostentatious regard for the religious enthusiasm of the Prophet's country.<sup>1</sup>

✓At the time of the Russo-Turkish War in 1876-78, the Muslims of India showed full sympathy for the Turks and also formed a Committee for helping the Turkish wounded soldiers and orphans. Large sums of money were collected and sent for their relief. The Pro-Turkish feelings among the Muslims were so strong at the time that the Viceroy of India Lord Lytton who kept himself in constant touch with Indian Muslims feelings had to warn Beaconsfield<sup>Disraeli</sup> about the deep concern of the Muslim community of India over the future of Turkey. In the Greeco-Turkish War in 1897 the Indian Muslims showed great sympathy for the Turks and celebrated Turkish victory with great zeal. ✓On this account Syed Ahmad Khan who was a staunch British loyalist felt uneasy and wrote an article questioning the claims of Ottoman Khalifa. His aim was to weaken the sympathy of Indian Muslims for the Turkish Khalifa.<sup>2</sup>

---

1. The Comrade: 4th Feb. and 6th May 1911.

2. Syed Ahmad Khan: 'Akhri Mazamin' p.50 printed by M. Fazaluddin Kashmiri Bazar Lahore 1898 quoted in Dr. Tara Chand's History of Freedom Movement in India Vol.II p.356.

During the nineteenth century it was British policy to bolster up the Ottoman Empire against Russia, partly because Russian expansion in Central Asia threatened the safety of the Indian North-West frontier <sup>well.</sup> as/In 1878, when the Russian armies were at the gates of Constantinople Indian troops were sent to Malta and Disraeli was ready to risk another war with Russia to save Turkey. At the same time, it was being impressed upon Indian Muslims that a great community of interest existed between them and Turkey and there was a great deal of talk about the British Empire as the greatest Muslim Empire in the World. This Pro-Turkish policy was reversed by Lord Salisbury after the Treaty of Berlin signed after the Russo-Turkish War.<sup>1</sup>

✓ News of the out break of hostilities between Turkey and Italy over Tripoli in 1911 had been received by Indian Muslims with great regret and the Government of India felt very much perturbed on account of the Muslim feelings for Turks. Although the prospect of any European complications were considered remote yet it was difficult to anticipate how far the alarming situation would react on European

---

1. K.K. Aziz: Britain and Muslim in India, pp.96-97.

politics. It was, however, earnestly hoped that it would not prevent the Royal visit to India. ~~It naturally created a lot of sympathy for their co-religionists the Turks in the murder of Indian Muslims~~

A representative meeting of Muslims was held in Calcutta at the residence of Moidul Islam Aga Syed Jalaluddin to protest against the iniquitous outrage on international morality perpetrated by Italy in Tripoli and to express practical sympathy with the Ottoman Empire in its present crisis. Great enthusiasm and indignation prevailed. The following telegrams were sent by President, the Hon. Mr. Arif :-

- (1) Home Secretary Simla - Representative Mussalmans in meeting assembled respectfully request intervention of Great Britain as the greatest Muslim power and lover of Justice and fair play to check Italy in her career of aggression and outrage on international morality regarding Tripoli.
- (2) Foreign Secretary, London - loyal Muslim subjects aggrieved and indignant at Italy's aggression in Tripoli. Pray for intervention of England the greatest Muslim power.

- (3) (i) Grand Vazier, (ii) President, Parliament  
Constantinople - Heart of Islam throbs in sympathy  
with Ottomans and expects Turkey to defend Islamic  
honour and prestige.

A Central Committee was formed with the Hon. Mr. Ghulam  
Hossein Ariff as President, with a strong representative  
Committee, the Committee to be called "Aid to Ottoman Red  
Crescent Society" for taking steps for the prevention of  
hostilities and collection of funds for the relief of  
sufferers of the war.

In pursuance of a resolution passed at the second  
meeting of the Indian Red Crescent Society, prayers were  
offered on Friday the 6th July in all the Calcutta  
mosques, for victory to the Ottoman armies.

The news of the outbreak of war between Turkey and  
Italy had created quite a sensation among the Muslims of  
Calicut and anxious enquiries were being made wherever  
possible as to the latest situation.<sup>1</sup>

Muslims newspapers had done a lot in espousing the  
cause of Turkey. Mention may be made in this connection of

---

1. Comrade 1911 Vol. 2 p. 293 (July to Dec.).

edited by Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, the 'Al-hilal' - the Urdu weekly of Calcutta, the two Urdu dailies - the 'Zamindar' of Lahore and the 'Hamdard' which was first published from Calcutta and with the change of Capital of India to Delhi from Delhi and the English weekly 'Comrade' which was first published from Calcutta and this was shifted to Delhi when the Capital of the Government of India was shifted to Delhi. These newspapers were very popular among Muslims and had captured their imaginations and especially the 'Al-hilal' and the 'Comrade' were responsible for changing the Muslim Politics from loyalty to the British cause to Pro-Turkish feelings on account of Pan Islamic feelings. The 'Al-hilal' was edited by Abdul Kalam Azad and was written in a new moving and soul stirring style, while the powerful writing of Mohammed Ali in the 'Comrade' turned the educated Indian Muslims into zealous supporters of the Turks. His urdu daily Hamdard and the 'Zamindar' of Lahore edited by the rebel Zafar Ali Khan also went to create sympathy for the Turks among their readers.

#### Establishment of Khuddama - Kaaba

An organization known as the Khuddama-Kaaba was formed to defend the Holy places of Islam, which at the time of outbreak of the first world war, were situated in the



Ottoman Empire and therefore the Holy places of Islam could be defended only when the Khilafat was defended.

✓ It drew the attention of the Indian Muslims to the cause of Islamic World, paved the way of the Khilafat Movement and sowed the seeds of unity among Hindus and Muslims. It really exposed the sinister designs of the British of first partitioning of Bengal and then its annulling it.

The Wars of Tripoli and Balkan transformed the spirit of revolt against the British domination into a sort of stubborn resistance and opposition. The Muslims started realising that the mischiefs of the West and the invasion of Ottoman Empire by Greece and Italy were just the remaining spark of the War of Crusade.

✓ The Holy places of Islam in Mecca, Medina and Jerusalem were included in the Arab part of the Ottoman Empire. It was feared that <sup>the</sup> defeat of Turkey would place these Holy places under the non-Muslim powers which on religious grounds was wrong. Muslims were duty bound to resist this. Maulana Abdul Bari was appointed <sup>as</sup> the President (Khuddama-Kaaba) of the said organization while Maulana Shaukat Ali and Sheikh Mughir Husain Kidwai were its Secretaries. ✓

Hakim Abdul Vali of Lucknow, Maulvi Ghulam Mohiuddin Wakil of Qassor, Nawab Viqar-ul-Mulk Bhadur of Amroha, Maulvi Ghulam Mohammad Fazil<sup>of</sup>/Hushirpur and Mr. Mushir Husnain Kidwai Maulana Shaukat Ali and Maulana Ahmad Ashraf etc.<sup>1</sup> were the members of Jamat-e-USli.

The inaugural meeting of this organization took place in the year 1912 at the residence<sup>of</sup> Maulana Abdul Bari of Firangi Mahal of Lucknow. Later on its Central Office was shifted to Kuchai Chelan Delhi.

The purpose of the organization was self evident. Those who swore to serve Kaaba were called 'Arkan Usli; for example, Abdul Vali of Lucknow, Maulana Shaukat Ali and Maulana Ahmad Ashraf of Kachochi, (Faizabad).

The President of the organization was not called sardar, instead he was called " Khadum-ul-Khuddam," Among Khuddam-e-Kaaba there were persons who were determined to dedicate their whole lives for the service of the Kaaba and technically speaking they were called 'Shaidas.'

After the attack of Italy Western Tripoli Indian Muslims were greatly anxious to protect 'Khana-Kaaba' Immanul, the Emperor of Italy had said on one occasion" our War planes

can even face Kaaba? It was natural in this state of anxiety and restlessness that an organization had been formed in order to defend the Khilafat and the Holy places of Islam. Maulana Mohammad Ali was an important member of Khuddama-Kaaba and attended its meetings. This organization was established so as to stress on the minds of Muslims to obey the word of God which they had been neglecting. This organization was concerned with the religious affairs of the Muslims. In spite of differences in beliefs, ideologies and practices it aimed at serving the religion.<sup>1</sup>

✓ Resolutions were passed at a protest meeting of Cawnpore Muslims (1) Asking the British Government to interfere and save the Turks from injury (2) Boycotting Italian goods and giving preference to British goods; (3) For raising funds for the widows and orphans of the killed and those injured in war, (4) Thanking the Indian Government for consenting to forward funds to the Turkish Consul.<sup>2</sup>

- 
1. Ali Brothers: Mohammed Ali Academy Lahore (Translated) pp. 93, 95, 221, 222 and 414.
  2. Comrade 11 Nov. 1911.

Large meetings of Muslims to demonstrate against Italy's action were held at a number of places in India. Resolutions, condemning the most high handed and the unjustifiable aggression of Italy in respect of Tripoli and respectfully soliciting the King Emperor to use his high influence in averting the progress of hostilities, were passed in these meetings.<sup>1</sup>

At the public meeting of Bombay Muslims, which was held in the Anjuman-i-Islam hall, the Hon. Mr. Ibrahim Rahimtoola moved the main resolution expressing high indignation at the aggression and outrageous action of Italy in declaring unjust war against Turkey and occupying Tripoli against all canons of international law.<sup>2</sup>

The Council of the All India Muslim League held on 7th Oct., 1911 expressed its resentment on Italy's unjustifiable and high-handed action in Tripoli and sympathises with Turkey in her undeserved troubles.<sup>3</sup>

The students of the M.A.O. College and the collegiate School Aligarh opened a fund for the relief of the sick and wounded Muslims in Tripoli and the families of the Muslim soldiers killed in the said war. Money, clothes,

---

1. Comrade 14th Oct. 1911, p.315.

2. Ibid. " " "

3. Ibid " " " "

finger rings, watches, stationary and furniture were freely placed at the service of their co-religionists. The students unanimously resolved to abstain from the variety of dishes served in the dining hall and contribute the savings thus effected to the Turkish relief fund.<sup>1</sup>

It was during this period that the College precincts were rocked at the news of the Italian attack on the Turkish possession of Tripoli. When Turkey desired to move its armies to Tripoli through Egypt, the British disallowed it. This caused great resentment amongst the students as it amounted to open support of the Italians by the British Government. They started holding daily meetings after evening prayers in the mosque and condemning in violent language the atrocities committed by the Italians against the small Turkish force fighting in Tripoli. Muslim papers especially the Comrade of Maulana Mohammad Ali, Al-Hilal of Abul Kalam Azad from Calcutta and the Zamindar of Maulana Zafar Ali Khan from Lahore, all strongly supported the Turkish cause.<sup>2</sup>

These writings were greatly responsible for changing radically the Muslim policies. The old Muslim leadership

---

1. The Aligarh Monthly, November 1912, p.357.

2. Choudhry Khaliquzzaman: Pathway to Pakistan, p.17.

consisting of the followers of Syed Ahmad Khan or  
Aligarh School, who stood for cent percent loyalty/<sup>to the British Government</sup> stood  
totally discredited on the Younger Muslim generations.

The dismemberment of Turkey had definitely started. During the war in Tripoli, the Balkan States agreed to take united action against Turkey and further decided to divide the Turkish territories. The massacres of the Christians in Macedonia in which large numbers of Greeks, Bulgarians and Serbians had lost their lives, inflamed the people of those states with the desire to liberate their brothers in Macedonia. Therefore, in October 1912, the four Balkan states, Montenegro, Serbia, Bulgaria and Greece, declared war on Turkey and achieved success.

That Turkey is weak, fanatical and misgoverned no one can honestly deny --- The chief powers of Christendom have all more or less an interest in the fortunes of an Empire which from being systematically aggressive has become a tottering and untoward neighbour.<sup>1</sup>

'The problem now is not how to keep Turkish Empire permanently a being ... but how to minimise the shock of its fall and what to substitute for it.' The succeeding war

---

1. J.A.R. Marriot: Eastern question p.309.

of partition was rather predatory and ended no epoch though possibly it may have begun one. It is interesting not as a settlement but as a symptom<sup>1</sup>

" For several months past the Muslims of India have been passing through a state of discontent. The unblushing brutality with which Russia was treating Persia, the apparently unprovoked assault of Italy upon the Turkish position in Tripoli and lastly the disappointment of the Indian Muslims over the Muslim University have all combined to create an atmosphere of restlessness and disaffection among the Muslim subjects of the British crown. And now, the long-dreaded 'trouble in Balkans' a life and death struggle between the sole leading Islamic power and four minor kingdoms of Eastern Europe - has considerably excited the already exasperated followers of the Arabian Prophet<sup>2</sup>

"Meetings have been held in various parts of India and resolutions passed denouncing the Balkan States and praying for the speedy success of the Porte. It was only the other day that the Rt.Hon'ble Syed Amir Ali, on behalf

---

1. J.A.R.Marriot: Eastern question p.437.

2. Indian Review Oct., 1912 p.833.

of the British Red Crescent Society, appealed to the British generosity for funds to alleviate distress among Muslims in the Balkan war. More significant is the stirring appeal His Highness the Agha Khan who is sending 20,000 pounds from Moscow to the British Red Crescent Fund has expressed the hope that all other projects of Indian Muslims, including the University of Aligarh, would be laid aside for the present in order to concentrate effort on the relief of suffering and distress in Turkey. Much more significant still is the letter from Mr. Shaukat Ali calling for Indian volunteers.

The combined aggression of the Balkan states against Turkey is bound to create a profound impression throughout the Islamic world. If the Montenegrin attack brings about a general war every Muslim will feel an irresistible call of duty to help those who will have to carry on a life and death struggle in defence of their honour and their rights. The feeling will be as strong and natural as the spiritual and moral ties that unite the followers of Islam. Some mischief-mongers have often tried to read into this feeling an aggressive political ambition or a burning hatred of Christendom. It is nothing of this kind.



The Muslims desire nothing more than that their brethren should be allowed to live in peace and freedom from the aggression of the racial and religious bigots in Europe.<sup>1</sup>

The Balkan wars reduced Turkey in Europe to Eastern Thrace, Constantinople and the Straits. Indian Muslims began to believe that European powers were engaged in a deliberate policy of destroying Islam.<sup>2</sup>

A more critical moment than the present for Islam can hardly be imagined, especially because the prestige of Turkey is synonymous with the prestige of Islam and the existence of the Ottoman Empire is essential for the secular progress of the Muslim races. Not only have the Balkan states conspired to make common cause against Turkey as a state, but they have (nothing can be more evident) determined to make war upon Islam as a rival religious force. Islam as a civilising force will disappear with the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire. And it necessarily follows that as soon as an independent "Caliphate" yields place to "Vassal Caliphate"- a consummation that is well within the ambition of a section

---

1. Indian Review pp. 833-837.

2. K.K. Aziz: Britain and Muslim India p.97.

of European diplomacy-Islam will become a by word for hypocrisy. It would mean the substitution of the spurious for the genuine; and will gradually lead to a complete demoralisation of the Muslim World. If Turkey falls, Islam can not stand. Turkey is, therefore, the backbone of Islam.<sup>1</sup>

The Muslims disliked British pact with Russian and contrasted British inaction during the Balkan wars with her championship of Turkey in former days. They saw that while Japan was proving the ability of an Asiatic power to make herself respected, the few remaining Muslim Powers, Morocco, Persia and Turkey were sinking.<sup>2</sup>

The progress of the unfortunate events in Balkan States was anxiously watched by the Muslims of India. The dismemberment of Turkey, evoked wide regret, in which some non-Muslims also shared and the fate of Muslim States, the treatment meted out to them by Europe made the deepest and most painful impression on every mind.<sup>3</sup>

~~The defeat of Turkey was felt by the whole of~~  
~~Islamic world.~~ The Muslims realised the full importance of the grave crisis in their history which roused in them a feeling of brotherhood. They had never felt the strength of Islam as a unifying force and never adhered to it so tenaciously as they did during and after the period.<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Comrade:- 2nd Nov. 1912 (Mohammad Asif Ali Delhi)

2. Name. Muslim India - 12. 125

Later, in the same year (1912) Muslims despatched a medical Red Crescent Mission to Turkey under the leadership of Dr. M.A. Ansari. It had been sponsored by Maulana Mohd. Ali. The students of M.A.O. College at Aligarh rose to the height of their solidarity with Muslim brethren in Turkey by foregoing all their varities and special dishes and taking to simple diet with a view to save money and help the Turks and some students of the College Khaliquzzaman, Shoib Quraishi, Abdul Azis Ansari, Manzoor Mahmood joined the mission and went to Turkey.<sup>1</sup> This sense of world fraternity was looked upon with grave suspicious in the higher circles of the Government.<sup>2</sup>

The Muslims by this attitude were all the more convinced that Britain was only keeping a show of her neutrality towards the Turkish Empire while in fact the British Statesmen were eager to see the dismemberment of the great Ottoman Empire and keen to share the spoils.<sup>3</sup>

Nawab Viqar-ul-Mulk in an article said, "The time has come when our youngmen have begun to realise that the real honour is the one which the people of the country

---

1. Khaliquzzaman: Pathway to Pakistan pp.20,21.  
2. Noman: Muslim India pp.129-130.  
3. Ibid p.132.

and not the one which the Government bestows! The youngmen of Aligarh manifested the greatest love for their faith and for the Muslims outside by the many acts of renunciation and self-abjuration. The Poems of Shibli and Hali, the articles of Viqar-ul-Mulk had undoubtedly moved ever soul. The veil of Pessimism was lifted.<sup>1</sup>

✓ The minds of the Ali Brothers - Maulana Mohammad Ali, Shaukat Ali and Maulana Abdul Kalam Azad were specially agitated over the sufferings of the Turks during the Balkan wars. And they were behind the movement to help Turkey.

"My feelings" wrote Mohammad Ali in his autobiography, "during in disastrous war in the Balkans were at one time so over powering that I must confess I even contemplated suicide."<sup>2</sup>

Maulana Shaukat Ali, in a letter the Aligarh Institute Gazette, wrote a stirring appeal to send a volunteer corps to fight against the Balkan states. His Highness the Agha Khan and Rt. Hon'ble Syed Ameer Ali showed full sympathy raised funds to alleviate distress among Muslims in the Balkan war.

---

1. Noman: Muslim India p.133.

2. Maulana Mohammad Ali: My life: A Fragment, p.49.

The Shift in Muslim Politics:

A marked change came over Muslims politics after 1911. Factors contributing to this great change was the annulment of partition of Bengal. This was looked upon by the Muslims as their betrayal by the British. Tripoli and Balkan wars and the hostility of European powers especially this Great Britain towards Turkey led to this growing feeling among young Muslims that they could no longer depend upon the British Government for the protection of their legitimate rights. Their trust in official promises had received a rude shock, and a shift in their traditional attitude of 'Sturdy loyalty' as had been advocated by Syed Ahmad Khan and his successor of the Aligarh School was now evident. This change in feeling appeared in definite terms in the resolution of the Muslims league at its session of December 1912 according to which the aim of the organization was the attainment of self-government suitable to India instead of adherence to loyalty to the government also meant that the league still refused to identify itself with the congress demand of unqualified self-Government; it retained the right to modify self-rule in accordance with Muslim rights,

interests and aspirations. Yet a logical corollary of this change was the coming together of the Muslim league and congress. Now it was possible for the two to co-operate against the British since both were dissatisfied with the prevailing conditions, though for different reasons.<sup>1</sup> When the first Great War broke out on 4th August 1914, it was generally apprehended that Turkey would join Germany. Maulana Mohammed Ali wired to Maulana Abdul Bari of Firangi Mahal who was the President of the Khuddama-Kaaba organization advising him to send a telegram to the Sultan of Turkey to avoid taking sides in war. On 31st August 1914 Maulana Abdul Bari sent the following telegram to the Sultan:

'Placing our faith and confidence, which we the Indian Muslims have in the Khilafat, we respectfully urge upon your Majesty either to support Britain or keep neutral in this war.<sup>2</sup> In total disregard of the advice of her Indian Muslim leaders, Turkey, as was expected, entered upon war against Britain. On 23rd Nov. 1914, the Sultan-Khalifa declared a holy war and summoned the Muslims of all the countries of the world to take up arms

---

1. K.K. Azizi: Britain and Muslim India. p.34-85.

2. Choudhry Khaliquzzaman: Pathway to Pakistan p.28.

against Great Britain and its Allies. A tremor ran through the Muslim India and the pulse of the Muslims vibrated with intense emotion when the news of the Turkish declaration of war against Great Britain reached this country.<sup>1</sup>

The Sultan of Turkey was the rightful head of the Muslim World Shias being excluded. It was the duty of every Muslim to help him. There were very large number of Muslims in the British army. Grave fears were expected of Muslims desertion or rebellion, because of the declaration of Jihad by the Khalifa.

✓ To avoid this the viceroy of India and a number of British ministers including the Prime-minister tried to pacify the Muslims by giving them assurances with regard to the safety of their Holy places and the maintenance of the prestige, position and Empire of their Khalifa after the war was over. The Muslims believed in these assurances and loyally co-operated with the Government and also rendered a lot of help to the British.

India's magnificent services in the war have evoked the highest terms of tribute from statesmen of

---

1. Indian Review: November 1914. p.898.

all parties. India has realized that the attainment of her highest political destiny could be achieved only by her remaining within the orbit of the British Empire.<sup>1</sup>

The Muslims of India were seething with discontent and anxiety as the war was taking its reckless course.<sup>2</sup> Without arms or a rallying centre for any big action, the Muslims could only look to the leadership of the Muslim League. But it was so weak that they could see no hope from that side. In their helplessness they turned towards their radical leaders to voice their feelings and sentiments and to take necessary measures to save their old historical institution the Khilafat from destruction. They looked to such personalities for guidance who had public confidence, like the Ali brothers, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Maulana Mahmudul Hasan, Maulana Abdul Bari, Hakim Ajmal Khan and Dr. Ansari. These simultaneously started to act individually, but seldom collectively or with determination, to take all possible measures to help the Turks.<sup>3</sup>

*Ltms*

- 
1. The Indian Review, Nov., 1918, p. 745.
  2. Choudhry Khaliquzzaman: Pathway to Pakistan p. 27.
  3. Choudhry Khaliquzzaman: Pathway to Pakistan p. 30.



Maulana Mohammad Ali wrote an article in the Comrade: 'Choice of The Turks', one of his masterpieces, in justification of Turkish action in joining Germany. It was very warmly applauded by the educated Muslims generally and in Aligarh in particular. But the Government thought it dangerous, suspended publication of the comrade and not only was its security confiscated but the Ali Brothers were interned in May 1915 and sent first to Mehroli, a village near Delhi and then transferred to Lansdowne. The Government had also a charge against the Ali Brothers that they were conspiring against the British with the help of some of the leaders of Afghanistan.<sup>1</sup>

Several other Muslim leaders started those years, weekly papers almost entirely devoted to the cause of Turkey. The most important of them was Maulana Abul Kalam Azad / <sup>Al Hilal</sup> Soaked in Islamic tradition and with many personal contacts with prominent Muslim leaders and reformer in Egypt, Turkey, Syria, Palestine, Iraq and Iran, like Mufti Abduh Rasheed Raza, Taqi Zada, Anwar Pasha and other young leaders of the young Turks. Azad was powerfully affected by political and cultural developments in these countries.

---

1. Choudhry Khaliquzzaman: Pathway to Pakistan p.32.

His weekly, Al-Hilal put out material which the Government of India considered highly objectionable, inflammatory and dangerous. A security was demanded from the paper under the press act and ultimately its press was confiscated in 1914. Azad was regarded as the most dangerous pan-Islamist.

The great Muslim leaders, who gave expression to the feelings of sympathy for the Turks and opposition to the Britain, were Maulanas Mohammad Ali, Shaukat Ali, Abul Kalam Azad and Maulana Mahmudul Hasan- the Principal of Deoband-the most important theological seminary of Indian Muslims. They openly favoured and showed full sympathy towards Turkey against Britain. ~~He cannot say whether the Ottoman Government has been altogether the victim of German hypnosis.~~ The plain fact with which these Muslim leaders were immediately concerned was the out break of hostilities between Turkey and England and the manner in which this unfortunate situation was to affect the Muslims of India. That war between Turkey and England was a calamity that the Indian Muslims would have given anything in the World to avert. They had hoped and prayed all these anxious days that it would somehow be averted and had even gone out

of their way to press the Sultan and his Ministers  
interms which would have seemed in some instances  
impertinents and inexcusable but for the stress of the  
deep anxiety and emotion under which they were framed.  
But the fates were disposed otherwise.

'The catastrophe they had feared so much has happened  
at last, and what is now left for them is to pray to  
God that they may be equal to this terrible and supreme  
trial!

It would be hypocrisy to disguise the facts that love  
of Turkey and her people is to the Indian Muslims a  
deep and abiding sentiment and that millions of them  
reverence the Sultan as their religious and temporal head.  
The unity of culture and faith has consecrated these  
feelings of sympathy and devotion, and they have remained  
strong and vital forces through the ages. The Turks have  
often blundered in the past and have sometimes been misled  
into dangerous courses through the folly of their rulers;  
but the Indian Muslims, though they always condemned  
them freely for their follies and blunders, could never  
help grieving with them in their grief and suffering  
extreme misery and anguish whenever disaster have

overwhelmed them and wrought their secular aim.

It would not, therefore, be supposed that the Indian Muslims would be indifferent to the fate of Turkey even though she might herself bring it upon her head. Their plight then can be well imagined in the situation in which they find themselves today. Through a cruel conjunction of circumstances their feelings of Islamic fraternity and their reverence for their religious and temporal head have been brought into direct conflict with their sense of plain secular duty.

They may sympathise with the Turks in their difficulties, but are not bound by any temporal or spiritual obligation to back them in every mundane quarrel of theirs which might as often as not be the fruit of a bad and blundering policy.

The declaration made by His Majesty's Government about the safety of the Muslim holy places has, we are sure, been received with relief and gratification by Indian Muslims. In order to remove the least shred of anxiety in this connection. We trust the principle of full<sup>and</sup> independent Muslims control over those places will be affirmed in the same unequivocal manner. The

Muslims can be trusted to act on the precept of Jesus Christ whom he reveres as a Prophet of God, and render Unto Caesar what is due to Caesar.

During this unhappy war many moments of dark anxiety and grief are bound to arise, and the whole period of its duration would be for the Muslims a time of acute and awful distress.

Indian Muslims know their duties. No one need be anxious on this score. They only wish their unique plight in this crisis may win just consideration if not sympathy from those who profess to be their well-wishers and friends.<sup>1</sup>

The Council of the All India Muslim league adopted the following resolutions and wired them to His Excellency the Viceroy: (1) "The Council of the All India Muslim league gives expression once more to the deep-rooted loyalty and sincere devotion of Muslims of India to the British crown and assures His Excellency the Viceroy that the participation of Turkey in the present war does not and cannot affect that loyalty and devotion in the

---

\*1. Comrade 7th Nov., 1914.

least degree. The Council is confident that no Muslim in India will swerve even to a hair's breadth from his paramount to his sovereign! (2) "The Council expresses its deep gratitude to the British Government for the assurance given to its Muslim subjects as to the immunity of the holy places of Islam in Arabia and other places from attack or molestation and for obtaining similar assurance from its Allies.<sup>1</sup>" The President of the 1915 session of the league, Mazhar-ul-Haq sadly remarked: "It is a sore point with us that the Government of our Khalifa should be at the war with Government of our king-Emperor. We should all have been pleased to see our brethren in the Faith fighting side by side with the soldiers of the British Empire. Whatever view one may take of the policy adopted by Islamic countries in the present war, Indian Muslims never desired, nor ever can desire, hostility between the British and Islamic Governments. That hostility should have come about is the greatest misfortune that could have befallen Muslims. It is the cherished desire of the followers of Islam that when peace comes - and pray God in that it may come soon-

---

1. The Indian Review, November 1914, p.915.

Muslim countries should be dealt with such a way that their dignity will not be compromised in the future:

During the I World War, Indian Muslims had expressed their uneasiness as to the outcome of policy of Britain towards Turkey and her fate. Indian Muslim leaders flung this 'solemn promise' at the British Government and demanded the Jazirat-ul Arab, including Mesopotamia, Arabia, Syria, and palestine with all the holy places situated therein, must always remain under the direct suzerainty of the Khalifa. The British Prime Minister, Mr. Lloyd George had declared on January 5th, 1918, that the British Government would not pursue a vindictive policy towards Turkey and had no intention of depriving the Turks of Asia Minor and Thrace which were predominantly Turkish.<sup>1</sup>

Indian Muslims gallantly fought for the British against their Co-religionists on this assurance and confidence which had been given to them by the British Government.

---

1. Mohammad Noman - Muslim India p.187.

### The origin of the Khilafat Movement

It was after the war, when the Britain was signing a peace treaty with Turkey, that the storm burst and the real policy of Great Britain became manifest.

At the Khilafat conference held at Delhi in November, 1919 it was resolved not to participate in the victory celebrations and to render all possible help to the All India anti-peace-celebration Committee of Delhi to disseminate the reasons for abstention from the victory carnival. It was also resolved that in the event of a satisfactory settlement of Turkish question not taking place the Muslims of India would progressively withhold all cooperation from the British and to give practical expression to their sense of dissatisfaction a progressive boycott of British Goods should be instituted.<sup>1</sup>

Further, that as early as possible a deputation on behalf of the Muslims of India be sent to England with the consent of His Excellency the Viceroy with the object of laying before the responsible British Ministers and others the true sentiments of the Muslims with regard

---

1. K.K.Aziz: Britain and Muslim India p.97.



to the Turkish and Khilafat questions and also that the deputation, if necessary, should proceed to U.S.A. to further the objects of the deputation. Mr. Gandhi dissented from the boycott resolution, giving his reasons.

"The Muslims and others naturally and rightly in sympathy with them, are justly sore at heart and anxious."<sup>1</sup>

✓ As Hakim Ajmal Khan said at the Conference. Lord Hardinge had given an assurance of the maintenance of the Turkish sovereignty over the religious places; so also had done Mr. Llyod George. President Wilson also gave an assurance of the maintenance of the Turkish sovereignty over the religious places; But now things were different and according to the present arrangement the entire Turkish power was being dismembered and the Sultan-Khalifa was being reduced to the position of the Pope of Rome.<sup>2</sup> Problem of Holy land or places of Islam agitated Indian Muslims. Details of proposed peace went to alarm the Muslims on account of the virtual dismemberment of Turkey.

---

1. Modern Review Dec. 1919 p.707

2. Ibid

When the war came to an end and victory was achieved, the Allied statesmen forgot their pledges and became determined to punish Turkey for her participation in the war on the side of Germany.

They wanted to abolish the Khilafat, to internationalise Constantinople, to place Arab provinces like Mesopotamia, Palestine and Syria under mandates, including the holy places in Arabia. By the period the war started Sherif Husain of Mecca had finally been won over by the British and in this money played a very considerable part. He induced the Arabs to deny the claims of the Sultan as Khalifa and even to revolt against him which they did. The Hijaz railway was destroyed. But after the war even the Sherif of Mecca - the British protege was not recognized as the Khalifa of Islam.

The Muslim contention was that the Nazirat-ul-arah including Mesopotamia, Arabia, Syria and Palestine with all the Holy places situated therein must always remain under the direct suzerainty and rule of the Khalifa. But as a result of the terms of the Armistice, Turkey was deprived of her home lands, Thrace was presented to Greece. Both Great Britain and France divided the Asiatic

portions of the Turkish Empire including the Holy places of Islam among themselves under the guise of a mandatories. A High commission was appointed by the Allied Powers, who to all intents and purposes were the rulers in Turkey, with H.M. the Sultan nothing better than a prisoner.<sup>1</sup>

The Allies attempted to end "Eastern question" which had baffled European diplomats for centuries, by confining Turkey to an Asian homeland and by disposing of, in one manner or another, all areas of the former Turkish Empire which had been such a bone of contention among the powers of Europe. They had already decided upon this course of action during the war was by means of secret Treaties.<sup>2</sup>

The peace negotiators at the Paris Peace conference talked openly of depriving Turkey of constantinople and her former Empire. The christian minorities of Turkey were to be redeemed by allowing Greece to remain in Smyrna and by the creation of an Armenian State.

- 
1. B.Pattabhi Sitaramayya: The History of the Indian National Congress p.189.
  2. ~~For details of Secret Treaties, please see~~ W.W. Gottles. Studies in secret diplomacy during the first World War pp.34, 149.

Independence was granted to Hedjaz and Mandato system was to be extended to the other Arab territories of the Turkish Empire. The trend of the officials Near Eastern Policy of Great Britain was particularly hostile to Turkey. The sentiments and policies of the British Prime-Minister Mr. Llyod George and the foreign minister Lord Curzon, who were the chief directors of British foreign policy, were openly anti-Turkish. Llyod George had a confirmed hatred for Turkey and an unbounded love and admiration for Greece. He was a follower of ~~the party of~~ Gladstone, whose policy was to drive the Turks, beg and baggage from Europe.<sup>1</sup>

As regards the solemn assurances given by the British Prime-Minister contained in his famous West Minister speech of 5th January 1918 in which he had assured that Great Britain was not fighting to deprive Turkey of its capital or of the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor and Thrace, the London Times expressed the view that "that was clearly not a pledge, but an offer. It was an invitation to Turkey to cease fighting a war which meant her own ruin. It was accompanied by a declaration that the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus were to be neutralised, and Arabia, Armenia, Mesopotamia, Syria

---

1. David Llyod George: Memories of the peace Conference, Vol. 11, p. 180.

and Palestine were entitled to a recognition of their separate national condition. Had Turkey chosen then to make peace with the Allies, She and her partisans might have been entitled to be benefitted by the British Prime-minister's declaration. But she elected to continue the war, and having been decisively beaten, she must abide by the consequence.<sup>1</sup>

There was a wide spread unrest in the Islamic World at the news of the proposed reduction of the spiritual and temporal powers of the ottoman Empire.<sup>2</sup>

There is no doubt that ~~considerable numbers of~~ Muslims ~~people~~ had been fortified by the pledges of President Wilson and the British Premier when they gave assurances in regard to the independence and integrity of the Ottoman Empire; it would indeed be a greivous disappointment if anything was done to thwart the hopes of the Muslim World. It is not therefore surprising ~~is~~ that the proposal for the disarmament of the Turkish Empire should fill the minds of the Indian Muslims with grief and resentment; and the Hindu subjects His Majesty

- 
1. London Times dated Dec. 20th, 1919.
  2. Arnold J. Toynbee: The western question in Greece and Turkey p.7.

cannot withhold their sympathy from fellow country men<sup>1</sup>.

The Muslims protested against the contemplated dismemberment of the Turkish Empire. The prominent members of the Muslim community like Sir Abbas Ali Baig, H.H. The Agha Khan, Mr. Amir Ali and others appealed jointly to the British Prime-minister to refrain from doing so. The following memorial was submitted to the British Foreign Secretary in January, 1919 and a copy forwarded to the Prime-minister. It was signed by His Highness Agha Khan, Abbas Ali Baig, Syed Amir Ali, Abdullah Yusuf Ali, Sheikh Mushir Husain Kidwai, M.H. Isphani, Abdul Aziz, Khwaja Kamal Uddin and 27 others.

"We, the undersigned Muslim subjects to His majesty, the King Emperor beg respectfully to represent to His Majesty's Government that we have read with great concern the suggestions recently put forward in the Press from various responsible quarters regarding the future of Constantinople to the effect that it should be taken from its present possessors, in spite of the Ottomans being the most populous single nationality

---

1. The Indian Review Aug. 1919.

in constantinople, and be made over to some christian people or state or be placed under international control. We, therefore, feel it our duty to point out at the earliest opportunity, that such a course, if adopted, would be in direct conflict with the vital principle of nationality placed in the fore-front of the War-aims of the Allies, and would cause not only among the Muslims of India but also among Muslims throughout the world grave dissatisfaction. In the course of four centuries constantinople has undergone complete transformation and is now in all essentials a Muslim City. It is honey-combed with Muslim institutions and is covered on all sides with memorials of their faith. Its population is predominantly Turkish by race and Muslim faith as was recently admitted in the clearest terms in the House of Commons. The solemn declaration of the Prime Minister made only a short time ago that the Turkish nation will retain their sovereignty unimpaired in their homeland, with constantinople as the capital of their territories, had a reassuring effect on the Muslim population of India and elsewhere, and we feel that any departure from that memorable pronouncement

would creat the gravest disappointment. The Muslims who have shed their blood or helped with their resources in the defence of the empire are entitled to expect that the principle of national unity and freedom will be maintained in the case of Turkey as in the case of the European people. And other course would give rise to a most painful impression that the high principles and lofty ideals which secured for the Allied cause the adhesion and loyal cooperation of the larger part of the Muslim world were abandoned in the case of Turkey because she is a Muslim State. We feel confident, however, that no racial or religious prejudices will be allowed to impair the trust of the Muslim nations in the good faith of the Allies, and that the settlement of this momentous world problem will be based on the principles of justice and equity, and of national rule, laid down by the Prime Minister of Great Britain and the President of the United States.<sup>1</sup>"

A mass meeting of the Muslims of Madras was held on January 17th, 1919 at the Victoria Public Hall to -

---

1. Indian Review, Feb. 1919. p.137.



discuss the Turkish situation and to appeal to his Imperial Majesty. The Hon. Mr. Yakub Hassan was in the chair. He delivered his address in urdu in which he said, "Now the war is over, the central European powers are laid by the heel, militarism is crushed and plans are seriously discussed for the abolition of the war for ever. The league of Nations is to stand sentinel to prevent international jealousies getting the better of the political discretion. There is no fear of Germany getting at India through Turkey... why then should Great Britain desire the dissolution of Turkey?

Has Great Britain thwarted the world dominating designs of Germany only to extend her dominance over a large part of the world?

As it is, the sun never sets in His Imperial Majesty's dominions. Should she not rest content with this, but like Germany should she desire to have place in the sun itself?

On the other hand as a powerful ally, Turkey can be a tower of strength to the British Government instead of establishing her protectorate piece meal over Turkish territory Why should not England become the friend and

protector of the whole Turkish Empire? Turkey had extended her hand of friendship. Let Great Britain grasp it with equal alacrity. In doing so England will please her millions of Muslim subjects. We want all the Holy places in Arabia, Palestine, Syria and Mesopotamia to remain under one Muslim Sovereign and that Sovereign will be our Khalifa ..... It is an admitted fact that the immense contributions of India in men, materials and Money were utilised almost wholly for the subjugation of Mesopotamia, Palestine and Syria and those countries were invaded not for the expansion of territories or sphere of influence of the British Empire but only to protect India from the attack of Germany.

India, therefore, has a right to be heard in the matter of the disposal of the countries temporarily subjugated by means of forced and resources of India. We, the Muslims of India, have therefore the double right of offering our counsel to Great Britain concerning the fates of Islamic countries, firstly on account of religious interests in those countries and secondly on account of the utilisation of the Indian forces, materials and money in the subjugation of those territories.

The following resolutions were also passed unanimously:- "That in the event of it being decided to grant an autonomous government to Mesopotamia in accordance with a common principle affecting belligerent territories, this meeting appeals that the autonomous Government so formed should be under the immediate suzerainty of the Turkish Empire. "That this meeting has seen with horror the rumour given currency to by some of the local papers that it is contemplated to place Mesopotamia under the guardianship of his Highness the Agha Khan and respectfully hopes that there is absolutely no truth in this rumour as the appointment will be viewed with the utmost disfavour by the Muslim World at large." "That this meeting sincerely trusts that the peace conference will be guided by the righteous spirit of meeting on equal justice to all belligerent nations, regardless of their nationality, race or religion and that its decisions would not be such as to land impression to the world that Turkey has suffered on account of its not being christian power.<sup>1</sup>"

---

1. Indian Annual Register 1920 pp.243-247.

Similarly, under the auspices of the Anjuman Moidab-i-Islam, Firangi Mahal Lucknow, a meeting of the Ulema or Muslim Divines was held under the presidency of Maulana Abdul Bari on the 26th Jan., 1919 to consider the question of Khalifat and the safety and integrity of the Holy places of Islam under the occupation of the British and Allied troops. The President dwelt at length with the various aspects of the Khilafat question and impressed upon his audience the necessity of frank and bold exposition of the views of Muslim community.

The following four resolutions were passed unanimously. ~~The first resolution was moved by Maulvi Daryabulhak as follows~~ 1. "That this meeting of the Ulema of Firangi Mahal while expressing its firm and sincere devotion to Sultan Mohammad VI, emphatically declares that according to the true doctrines of Islam, none but the present sultan of Turkey is the rightful Khalifa and that Islam never allows the interference of non-Muslims in deciding the question of Khilafat. 20a

This meeting of Ulema fully supports the views expressed by other Muslim meetings on the question."

~~The second resolution was moved by Maulana Qutubuddin:~~  
2. "That this meeting of the Ulema while declaring that the

religious tolerance and liberty are the basis of their loyalty and devotion to the King Emperor and reaffirming their faith in the justice of Government, desires to impress upon the attention of the Imperial government the commandments of Sharia-i-Islam which emphatically declares that the Holy places including constantinople should remain under the rule of the Khalifa. This meeting, therefore, urges upon the British Government to use its influence with the peace conference in order that the occupied territory of the Sultan of Turkey should be restored to him. A peace without that can never satisfy the Muslims."The third resolution was moved from the chair

"The meeting supports the proposal that a Fatwa about the Khilafat and along with it a Sketch of the boundry lines of Arabia and other occupied Islamic territories should be prepared and signed by all the Ulema in India, and after consulting legal authorities, copies of the same be sent to the Secretary of State for India and His Excellency the Viceroy, that the British Government should no misunderstanding on this important questions."

~~Another resolution was moved by Maulvi Nasir-ud-din~~  
~~and supported by Maulvi Sahawut Ullah 4.~~"That this meeting

while sincerely desiring to see Arabia thrive and prosper under purely Muslim rule and reaffirming the views expressed by the Muslims about past conduct of Sharif Husain Pasha, highly appreciates the wise action of the Sharif in disavowing this title and claim to the Khilafat to which he has no right under the commandant of Islam." The copies of these resolutions were also wired to the British Premier and His Excellency the Viceroy.<sup>1</sup>

Agitation against Rowlatt Act.

The Delhi congress brought no peace to the country. The Rowlatt Bills made their appearance early in February 1919. They were two in number, - one of them being meant to be introduced in spring session. The other a temporary measure, intended to deal with the situation arising from the expiry of the Defence of India Act, six months after the formal conclusion of peace. It was framed to enable anarchical offences to be tried expeditiously by a strong court of three High Court Judges with no right of appeal in areas where offences of a revolutionary character were prevalent.

---

1. Indian Annual Register 1920 pp.248-49.

It also provided for powers to order persons suspected to be concerned in movements likely to lead to the commission of offences against the state, to furnish security, to reside in a particular place, or to abstain from any specified act. And as a safeguard, an investigating authority composed of one judge and one non-official was to examine the material upon which orders against any person were framed.

Thirdly local Governments were given powers to arrest persons reasonably believed to be connected with certain offences, the commission of which threatened public safety, and to confine them in such places and under such conditions as were prescribed. Further, dangerous characters already under control or in confinement could be continuously detained under the Bill. The second Bill was meant to cause a permanent change in the ordinary criminal law of the land.

Following the Rowlatt Report which had been published on 19.1.1919, the Rowlatt Bills were introduced into the supreme legislative council by Sir William Vincent on the 6th Feb., 1919. ~~and the~~ The second was dropped, and only the first was passed in the third week of March 1919.

✓ Gandhiji decided to oppose these bills by launching Satyagraha movement. For this object he had toured the country extensively and was received with great respect every where. What was it that had endeared this comparative stranger in the country to all provinces and commanded his equally strange programme of Satyagraha to the people all over? Let the Government answer!<sup>1</sup>✓

Believing as he does in the superiority of 'Soul Force' over material might, Gandhiji was led to believe that it was his duty to employ against the Rowlatt Act that weapon of passive Resistance or Satyagrah which he had used effectively in South Africa. It was announced on the 24th Feb. that he would lead a passive Resistance or Satyagrah movement if the bills were passed. This announcement was regarded as being of the utmost gravity both by Government and by many of the Indian politicians. Thus for the first time a mass non-violent movement with the novel weapon of Satyagraha which was a spiritual weapon was started by Gandhiji. This was a revolutionary step and went to revolutionize Indian politics.

---

1. B. Pattabhi Sita Ramayya: The History of the Indian National Congress Vol. I. p.160 (Vide India, 1919).



On the 18th March he published a pledge against the Rowlatt bills which ran as follows. "Being conscientiously of opinion that the bill known as the Indian criminal law Amendment Bill No. of 1919, and the criminal law Emergency powers Bill No.2 of 1919, are unjust subversive of the principles of liberty and justice and destructive of the elementary rights of an individual on which the safety of India as a whole and the State itself is based, we solemnly affirm that in the event of these Bills becoming law and until they are withdrawn, we shall refuse civilly to obey these laws and such other laws as the committee, hereafter to be appointed, may think fit, and we further affirm that in the struggle we will faithfully follow truth and refrain, from violence to life, person or property.<sup>1</sup> Gandhiji had appealed to hold non-violent-demonstration throughout the country against these repressive measures on April 6, 1919.

Accordingly demonstrations on the 6th April were held on a country wide scale. "One noticeable feature of the general excitement," says 'India, 1919', was the unprecedented fraternization between the Hindus and the Muslims. Their union, between the leaders, had now for

---

1. B. Pattabhi Sitaramayya: The History of the Indian National Congress p.161.

long been a fixed plan of the nationalist platform. In this time of public excitement, even the lower classes agreed for once to forget their differences. Extraordinary scenes of fraternization occurred. Hindu-Muslim unity was the watch word of processions vindicated both by cries and by banners. The one immediate cause for such a unity was the disgust that Muslims felt at the position of Turkey being unsettled after the war and the danger to the Khilafat, and the Hindus fully sympathised with those feelings<sup>1</sup>.

This Satyagraha campaign continued through out April 1919.

A memorandum concerning the future of Turkish Empire was presented in March 1919 to Mr. Balfour, the British Foreign Secretary, by His Highness the Agha Khan, the Right Hon. Mr. Ameer Ali, Sir Abbas Ali Beg, Mr. M.H. Ispahani and a few others. In this document they said:- "As there is no Mohammadan representative on the peace conference to place before it the opinions of His Majesty's Muslim subjects concerning the vast problems affecting the whole Islamic world, we submit those views in this memorial. We welcome the proposal of the establishment of

---

1. B.Pattabbi Sittaramayya: The History of the Indian National Congress p.162.

self-governing institutions in the occupied provinces of Turkey and in Armenia under the guarantees of the league of nations, but we most strongly deprecate the suggestion to sever them absolutely from the Turkish Empire, our reasons for this submission are not sentimental; they are founded on grounds of expediency and policy which, we respectfully venture to think, deserve the serious consideration of His Majesty's Government and the Allied and Associated Powers. The evidence as to the depth of feeling, not only among the vast Muslim population of India but also among the Afghans and the frontier tribes who form the bulk of the Musalman element in the Indian army, against the dismemberment of Turkey and in favour of the preservation of her prestige, is accumulating day by day. We hope that with the disappearance of the two empires that had hitherto exploited Asiatic unrest and misgovernment to their own advantage with a view to final political or economic absorption, the new peace would assure the pacific development of western and Middle Asia on durable lines. We have no hesitation in expressing our

conviction that Turkey, under a Government such as she has to now been fortunate enough to obtain, an immense source of strength to England and the Allied powers who rule over large masses of Muslims..... We venture strongly to urge that these proposed new autonomous states should not be withdrawn from the spiritual Suzerainty of the Ottoman sovereign as Khalifa ..... our reasons for making this submission are based, first on our desire for the peaceable development of western Asia, and secondly on the necessity of an endeavour on the part of His Majesty's Government to meet the wishes and legitimate feelings of the Mussalman who form one fourth of the population of the Empire.<sup>1</sup>"

---

1. India, London, dated 4th April, 1919.

The role of Ali Brothers:

Both Shaukat Ali and Mohammad Ali had rendered great services and sacrifices to Islam and to the national struggle. Their role in the Khilafat was really grand. The Khilafat movement owes its existence to a very large extent to these brothers.

Maulana Shaukat Ali had served in the opium department. He had become very popular among the educated Muslims of India because he had been the secretary of the old boys Association of A.M.O. College Aligarh. He had toured the country with the late Agha Khan to raise funds for the Muslim University and on this account had become an all India figure. He was among those who joined the Khuddama-e-Kaaba, and was one of the secretaries of this body.

Mohammad Ali had started 'Comrade' from Calcutta but when the seat of the Central Government was transferred to Delhi, he also shifted his paper to the new Capital into Delhi in September, 1912. His object in starting the paper was to serve his community and "to bring about better relations between race and race and the rulers and the ruled. His aim was to obliterate the line of demarcation between the two. He always advocated Hindu Muslim Unity through his paper,

He had also started the HAMDARD a Urdu daily which had become very popular.

Mohammed Ali was amongst the founders of the Muslim league in the year 1906. The object with which the league was started was to 'safeguard the interest of the Muslim Community and to promote the feeling of loyalty to the Government'.<sup>1</sup> Through this 'Comrade' and 'Hamdard', Mohammad Ali changed the course of Muslim politics. At the time of the Balkan War when there was a utter lack of medical facilities to the wounded soldiers, Mohammad Ali came out with the proposal of sending a medical mission to Turkey. Indian Muslims favourably responded to his appeal for funds. And a Red-Crescent Mission was sent to Turkey in 1912 which rendered Yeoman's service wounded Turk soldiers. In the beginning Mohammad Ali's attitude was not hostile towards the British Government. But he loved Turkey as it was the only Muslim power worth the name. The LONDON TIMES took upon itself the duties of the Foreign Minister of Turkey and advised her to remain neutral<sup>in the forthcoming war</sup> and warned her against waging war even on Greece. The whole article

---

1. G.S. Wateson: Eminent Musalmans pp.508,512,513, 514 & 516.

was provocative and illogical. Mohammad Ali wrote a very strong reply in the 'Comrade' of 16th Sept. 1914. The authorities in India grew nervous, thought Mohammad Ali was supporting the King's enemies and therefore ordered the securities of both the 'Comrade' and the 'Hamdard' be forfeited. This was not considered enough. The activities of the Ali Brothers were considered highly dangerous and both of them interned in May, 1915.

No reason was assigned for their internment. Protest meetings were held throughout India, which demanded from the Government the reason for such a procedure. It was in vain. No reason was given by the Government. They were removed from Mahrauli to Chindwara. During the period of internment both the brothers made a deep study of Islam and World's history. The brothers had been interned under the Defence of India Act.<sup>1</sup>

~~Shaukat Ali and his brother Mohammed Ali's activities had been considered so much dangerous that both of them were interned during the war. It was only on the eve~~

---

1. G.S. Nateson: Eminent Musalmans pp.520,525 & 527.

i.e. in December 1919  
of Amritsar Congress/that they were released and after  
their release they joined the Congress with them,  
Muslims joined the Congress in large numbers. In fact  
they joined it enbloc and the Congress really became  
a national organization. Both these brothers led the  
Khilafat movement. It was Maulana Shaukat Ali who  
supplied the heart to the Khilafat movement. Even in  
the early days of the movement Gandhiji discerned the  
greatness of this 'Big Man' and had implicit trust in  
him. It was largely the support that Gandhiji received  
from Shaukat Ali, that encouraged him to launch the  
non-cooperation movement in the country. It was to a  
very large extent Maulana Shaukat who was responsible  
to have brought the workers of the two communities  
together.

Ali Brothers wrote to the Viceroy at the end of  
April, 1919 that "Muslim loyalty and support had so  
often been assured to Government in our generation, and  
even Muslim contentment was so often unduly taken for  
granted that other communities had with some justice  
made our attitude towards Government almost a matter of  
reproach. It was strange return for all this loyalty



and support that without any effective protest and often with the concurrence of His Majesty's Government blow after blow was aimed at the temporal power of Islam .....

Government could not have been unaware of the sorrow and sufferings that all this entailed to the Muslims of India. No section of the community remained unaffected or unmoved. Princes in their palaces and peasants in their huts alike passed anxious days and sleepless nights. It was not, however, the fear of losing political dominance that troubled Muslims most. The spiritual force of Islam does not depend on political supremacy and far the most vital tradition of our faith is the humble beginnings of Islam in the midst of hostile elements of extra-ordinary potency and malice and the ceaseless persecution of our prophet during the greater part of his prophetic career. What the cruel occurrences in Tripoli and the Balkans, at Holy Meshad and Tabriz had led Muslims to apprehend was, that the temporal power of Islam might be so weakened that it might become liable to suffer, without adequate power to prevent, the curtailment of its spiritual influence

through the pressure of the temporal power OF RIVAL CREEDS. The Muslim Press of India did every thing in its power to warn the Government against the disastrous consequences of the policy it seemed bent on pursuing, and no method was left untried of impressing Great Britain that if she desires to retain the good will of the Muslims, she must be a friend and keep the Khilafat on her side and deal more fairly with Muslim kingdom and countries such as Persia, Afganistan and Morocco. But not one of these warnings was heeded. The result was inevitable and when war was declared between Great Britain and Turkey some sort of the apologia as well as an assurance was felt to be needed. Accordingly on the 2nd, November, 1914, on the authority of His Majesty's Government, the Viceroy gave a most solemn pledge in regard to the Holy places of Arabia including the Holy Shrines of Mesopotamia and the part of Jeddah in order that there may be no misunderstandings on the part of His Majesty's most loyal Muslim subjects as to the attitude of His Majesty's Government in this war. This pledge was to the effect that these Holy places and Jeddah will be immune..... from attack or molestation

by the British naval and military force .... As for Mesopotamia, the land of the Holy Shrines, a perusal of the Mesopotamia commission's report makes it abundantly clear that an attack which had been provided for a month before the declaration of war, was already in progress when the pledge of immunity was being given. With the varying fortunes of the war the desire of an advance on Baghdad varied in intensity. But the disastrous result of the Gallipoli campaign made His Majesty's Government utterly regardless of their solemn assurances..... As the sequel has only too plainly proved Holy Najaf, Karbela, Kazmain and samarra remained no more immune from attack or molestation then did Baghdad and today all are under British occupation and control. What is still more intolerable Indian Muslims including rulers of States and their subjects and civilians as well as soldiers, have been required to assist in the prosecution of a war against the Khilafat and given no option to stop further assistance when the Khalifa declared a Jihad ..... we have now only to define the more particularly Muslim demands though we are happy in the belief that they are no longer

exclusively urged by the Muslims of India, but have received from our fellow countrymen of other creeds also, a firm pledge of support even unto death.

They put forward the following demands:

- (1) There should never be any attempt to interfere by pressure or persuasion in the free choice, by the Muslims, of the Khalifa of their Prophet.
- (2) No Muslim, whether a soldier or a civilian, should be asked to assist in any manner what soever in the prosecution of a war or of any other hostile design against the Khalifa when he has declared a Jihad in the exercise of the functions of the Khilafat, and such assistance has become Haram thereafter according to the law of Islam, and any Muslim unforgoing at present any form of Punishment for their refusal to render such assistance should be given complete amnesty.
- (3) No part of the territories included in the expression Jazirat-ul-Arab as defined by the Muslim religious authorities should be directly or indirectly occupied or subjected to any form of non-Muslim control, but must remain as here-to-fore under independent Muslim occupation and control as required by the testamentary injunctions of the Holy Prophet.

(4) There should be no attempt to remove whether directly or indirectly, from the independent, indivisible, and inalienable sovereignty of the Khalifa, who is the recognised servant of the Holy places and warden of the Holy Shrines, any portion of the territories in which such Holy places and Shrines are situated, including the territories in which are situated the three sacred Harems of Mecca, Medina and Jerusalem and the Holy Shrines in Najaf, Karbela, Baghdad, Kazmain, Samarra, Constantinople and Konieh, and such territories should forthwith be evacuated by the forces of His Majesty and of the Allies and Association Governments and restored to the Khalifa, the Sultan of Ottoman Empire.

(5) Nor should there be any such attempt to dismember and parcel out even among Muslim Government or in any other manner weaken the Khalifa's empire with the object of weakening the temporal power of Islam.

(6) His Majesty's Government should restore<sup>to</sup> the Khalifa the Villayet of Egypt and should make determined efforts to induce other powers also to restore similarly such other territories like Bosnia, Herzegovina and Tripoli,

as they have forcibly been taken from him, and similar justice should be done in the case of other Muslim territories like those of Algiers, Tunis, Morocco, the Caucasus and the Khanates and Kingdom of Central Asia.

(7) No Muslim should in any manner be deprived of his liberty or otherwise punished, molested or disquieted by reason of his expressing and promoting sympathy with his brothers Muslims in any part of the world, or maintaining and strengthening the allegiance of all Muslims to the Khalifa of the Holy Prophet; and all persons thus dealt with should be forth with set at liberty and all news papers suppressed for a like reason should be permitted a free publication.

We now urge on your Excellency's Government the extreme necessity of an early satisfaction of these legitimate demands of the Indian Muslims.... We desire to declare that we shall wait for a reasonable time for an indication of a change for the better in the Government's attitude and if no convincing proof is given of such a change at an early date, and Muslim claims continue to receive the same disdainful treatment, it will be our duty to ask for our passports and to recommend

the same grave and extremely painful step to our coreligionists so that they and we could migrate to some other land where to be a believing Muslim and an ardent patriot is not considered a crime.<sup>1</sup>"

---

1. Quoted in confidential report on the non-cooperation and Khilafat Movement by the Dy. Director, Intelligence Bureau Govt. of India pp.137-140.

From the memorial addressed by the Muslim Community  
in England to the Prime Minister on June 14, 1919.

Mr. Amir Ali and Sir Abbas Ali Beg addressed a memorial to the Prime Minister <sup>of Great</sup> Britain in which they said That Turkey Proper and Thrace with constantinople as its capital should be left intact and uninterferred with under the sovereignty of the Sultan, that his temporal Power over the Turkish state should not be attempted to be reduced or diminished by any sort of mandate and the principle of self determination which has been applied to Christian people of Europe should be made applicable to the Muslim people as well and that in the interest of the peaceful development of western Asia the Suzerainty of Khalifa over the non-Turkish provinces of the Ottoman Empire be left undisturbed. They demanded the restoration of Turkey to essentially her prewar status.

The Sultan-Khalifa must retain Constantinople, the seat of the Khilafat; Turkish sovereignty must be restored over the Jazirat-ul-Arab, the Holy places of Islam and Holy Shrines and finally Turkey must not be deprived of her control of Smyrna or Thrace.



The Muslims of India took steps to organise a powerful anti-British Khilafat Movement, to protest and to give an effective expression to their feelings against the dismemberment of their Khalifa's Empire which according to them was being done by the Allies, particularly by Great Britain, in gross violation of all the Principles of freedom, Justice and self-determination and indirect conflict with all canons of political and international morality.<sup>1</sup>

On 21st and 22nd. September, 1919 a large Muslim Conference took place at Rifah-i-Am Lucknow in which about 5000 Muslims from all parts of India participated. This conference was presided over in its two sittings by Maulana Abdul Bari of Firangi Mahal Lucknow and the Hon'ble Seth Ibrahim Haroon Jafar of Poona respectively. Eight resolutions were passed. The first resolution referred to the Khilafat stating that the temporal power of the Khalifa is indispensable for maintaining his spiritual dignity. The second resolution asked for the maintenance of the integrity of the Holy places which must remain free from non-Muslim influence. The third resolution demanded that in accordance with the

---

1. The Indian Review Aug. 1919 p.518.

promises made in the Prime Minister's speech of the 5th January, 1918, the rich and renowned lands of Thrace and Asia Minor with Constantinople as their Capital, having a predominant Muslim population, must remain under the Turkish Sovereignty. The fourth resolution demanded the evacuation of Smyrna and Hinterland by Greeks and expressed indignation at the atrocious deeds which were reported to have been committed by Greeks on the Muslim inhabitants. The fifth resolution proposed that the copies of the above resolutions be sent to the Viceroy with a request that he should submit them to His Majesty's Government with his recommendations and representation of Muslim sentiments on the Turkish question. The sixth resolution fixed 17th October, 1919 as an universal day of prayer in Islamic India for the preservation of the Khalifa's full dignity and for holding a meeting of protest. The seventh resolution adopted the Khilafat Committee of Bombay as a permanent institution and resolved to establish branches thereof in all provinces. The eighth resolution was to the effect that the proceedings should be published in the Press.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. Indian Annual Register 1920, pp.250-251 and Muslim outlook, London, October 30, 1919.

In pursuance of a resolution passed at the All India Muslim Conference at Lucknow in the month of September, October 17, 1919 was observed as Khilafat Day by the Muslims throughout the length and breadth of the country. Prayers were said by them in almost every city and town of India for the preservation of their Khalifa's full dignity and the integrity of his Empire. The big demonstrations at Bombay and other places passed off peacefully without any act of Violence, Mahatma Gandhi called the 'Khilafat Day' a great day in Indian history and gave credit to the organizers of the day for avoiding mass meetings and everything tending to bring together large crowds of ignorant and irresponsible people. He regarded the big demonstration as a triumph of Satyagraha and asked Muslims to realise their own strength and follow up the demonstration by sustained and intelligent effort. ✓The Khilafat, he observed, was not only the cause of 80 million Muslims of India but also 220 million Hindus.<sup>1</sup>✓

Khilafat day was also observed by the Muslims of London, where a by Muslim Congregation assembled in the mosque

---

1. M.K.Gandhi: Young India, Vol.1, pp.134.137.

at Campden Hill Road and said prayers for the preservation of the Khalifa and his Kingdom and for the frustration of the schemes of those who wanted to destroy Islamic unity.

After the prayer was over a meeting was held under the Chairmanship of Mr. Marmaduke Pickthall, who condemned the Christian powers for attempting to create schism in the Muslim world by denying the claim of the Sultan of Turkey to Khilafat and by instigating and encouraging other false claimants to claim Khilafat for themselves. He asked the European Powers not to injure and insult the Muslims and to leave them alone to pursue in peace the path of progress and advancement. Resolutions expressing complete faith in the Khilafat of the Sultan of Turkey and emphasising the necessity of political independence of Khalifa and protesting against the systematic vilification in the European press of the Turkish patriots, were passed. Copies of the resolutions passed were forwarded to the British Prime-Minister and telegrams expressing unalterable devotion of Muslims, were sent to the Sultan of Turkey.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. Muslim outlook, London, October 23rd, 1919.

✓ In the beginning of November 1919 the Delhi Khilafat Committee, of which Hakim Ajmal Khan was the president and Mr. Asaf Ali was the Secretary, decided to convene an all India Khilafat conference to deliberate on the Khilafat question. The conference was to consider not only the situation arising out of the Khilafat betrayal but also the question as to whether India should participated in <sup>the</sup> /victory celebrations and the questions of Punjab wrongs and cow protection. The conference took place at Delhi on 23rd, November, 1919 under the presidentship of Mr. Fazlul Haq. This was a very big and representative gathering and delegates from almost all the provinces of India attended to take the final decision about the attitude to be adopted towards the British/<sup>Government</sup> in view of its breach of <sup>number of non-</sup> faith regarding Turkey. A/ Muslim leaders also attended it. Prominent among these were Mahatma Gandhi and Swami Shradhanand, the famous Arya Samaj leader. It was at this conference that Gandhiji for the first time proposed his non cooperation as a remedy to the Muslims if the Khilafat wrong remained unrectified. As many as six resolutions were passed at the conference. The first resolution placed on record the profound gratitude of the Muslims of India to Mahatma Gandhi and other Hindu compatriots who had evinced

deep interest in the Khilafat question. The second resolution enjoined upon Indian Muslims to scrupulously refrain from participating in the forth coming Victory celebrations in view of the heart rending events relating to Turkey, Khilafat, the sacred places in <sup>and Mesopotamia</sup> persia/which had been occasioned by the conclusion of peace and further requested all the Khilafat committees and Indian Muslims to render all possible help to the All India Anti-Peace celebrations Committee of Delhi with Dr. Ansari as its president, whose aims and object were to widely disseminate the reasons for abstention from the victory celebrations. The third resolution declared that in the event of a satisfactory settlement of the Turkish question not taking place, the Muslims of India shall progressively withhold all cooperation from the British Government. A Committee with Mr. Fazlul Haq and some other persons as members was appointed to make suggestions with a view to give practical effect to the above resolution in the event contemplated.

The fourth resolution made it clear that in the event of a satisfactory settlement of the Turkish question not taking place, the Muslims of India should institute a progressive boycott of British goods to give practical expression to their sense of dissatisfaction. A committee

with Syed Zahur Ahmad and few others as members was appointed to make necessary suggestions in this regard. The fifth resolution said that as early as possible a deputation on behalf of the Muslims of India be sent to England with the consent of His Excellency the Viceroy, with the object of laying before the responsible British ministers and others the true sentiments of Muslims with regard to the Turkish and Khilafat questions and further that if necessary, it should also proceed to the U.S.A. to further the objects of the deputations. By the sixth resolution the conference appointed the Raja of Mahmudabad and a few other Muslim leaders, with power to coopt other members from among the leading Muslims in London, to form the deputation.<sup>1</sup>

The joint Hindu-Muslim session of the All India Khilafat conference was held on 21st November, 1919 at Delhi. Over a thousand people including delegates from different provinces attended. Among the prominent Hindu leaders present were Mahatma Gandhi, Pt. Madan Mohan Malviya, Pt. Moti Lal Nehru Swami Shradhdhanand, Rai Sahib Pearey Lal, Mr. Madhu Sudan Lal, Mr. Jawahar Lal Nehru and several others.

---

1. Muslim out look, London, dated 8 Jan., 1920.

On Mr. Faslul Haq's proposal, which was supported by Dr. Ansari and a number of other delegates from various provinces, Mahatma Gandhi presided over the Conference. In his presidential address Gandhiji, after assuring the Muslims of unconditional Hindu support, justified the Khilafat Conference decision not to participate in the peace celebrations in view of the deep anxiety of Muslims on account of the fact that the Khilafat question was not satisfactorily solved and was hanging in the balance. He then warned the Government that if justice was not done to Muslims they would be compelled to withdraw cooperation from it and at the end of his address he emphasised the necessity of not mixing the Khilafat question with the Punjab grievances or the cow sacrifice question, so that proper place and value might be given to it. After Gandhiji's address Hakim Ajmal Khan moved a resolution declaring that it was not possible for Indians to participate in the forth coming peace celebrations as the Khilafat question, which was part of the peace programme and which affected the vital interests of the eight crores of Muslims of India and was therefore a national question, was still unsettled. This resolution was supported by Swami Shraddhanand on the ground that the cause of the Muslim was just.



The Hindus had joined with them as they were children of the same soil and it was their duty to help the Muslims in their distress. He warned the Hindus that they should not join the Muslims in any spirit of barter. The resolution was then put to vote and unanimously carried out.<sup>1</sup>

The second session of the all India Khilafat Conference was held on 31st. December, 1919 in the congress pandel at Amritsar under the president ship of Maulana Shaukat Ali. Among those who attended were Mahatma Gandhi, Swami Shraddhanand, Mrs. Annie Besant, Pandit Ram Bhuji Datt chowdhry and Pandit Madan Malviya, / As many as eight resolutions on the question of Turkey, Khilafat and the Holy places were passed by the conference. The first resolution expressed profound devotion of the Muslims to the commander of the faithful and the successor to the Holy prophet of Islam, the sultan of Turkey and prayed to Almighty that his temporal and spiritual power may last for ever. The second resolution said that in accordance with the decision of the all India Khilafat

---

1. The Mussalman, dated November 28, 1919.

Conference held at Delhi two representative deputations of the Muslims should proceed to England and America before 15th January or at the latest by the end of January and that His Excellency the Viceroy be requested as early as possible to accord permission to the deputation and to forward to His Majesty the King Emperor and his ministers by cablegram the request that the deputations be received by them and also to intimate their departure. The third resolution enumerated the names of the persons who were to be the members of the deputation which was to wait upon the viceroy to obtain his permission for the deputation to proceed to England and America. The fourth resolved that a representative Muslim deputation be sent to constantinople so that on behalf of the Indian Muslims it may express humble devotion and sentiments of Islamic brotherhood before the commander of the faithful, the successor of the Holy Prophet, the Sultan of Turkey. It was also resolved that arrangements be made for sending the deputation ~~so far possible~~ along with other deputations proceeding to England and America. The fifth resolution expressed the extreme sorrow and regret of the All India Khilafat Conference held at Amritsar that the demands of

the Indian Muslims regarding Khilafat, Jaziratul Arab, Holy places and the preservation of the Status quo anti Belum of the Ottoman Empire had not yet been acceded to and that on the contrary utterances of the ministers of the British crown from time to time had given rise to strong suspicions that the representatives of the British Government did not desire that those demands should be acceded to. The resolution went on to say that this conference deemed it absolutely essential to declare that the Indian Muslims still stood firmly by those demands which the law of Islam made it incumbent upon them to formulate and express and the conference desired to declare in the clearest possible manner that if the British Government would accept terms in the peace conference as may be inconsistent with the requirements of the Muslim faith, in that case the Muslim attitude would be governed by the obligations vigorously imposed upon them by their faith and for this the British Government alone would be responsible.

The sixth resolution related to the opening of a Khilafat fund and provided for the collection of at least a sum of ten lacs of rupees from every part of India by the

Central Khilafat Committee.

The last resolution was with regard to the convening of a session of the All India Khilafat Conference at Bombay to discuss and approve the draft constitution of the Central Khilafat Committee of India, when the Conference came to a close Maulana Chaudat Ali in his capacity as the president of the Amritsar session of the All India Khilafat Conference sent a telegram to the Viceroy requesting him to receive at an early date a small deputation of the leading representative of Muslims of India to lay before him the views and the religious sentiments of the Muslims in connection with the Turkish question.<sup>1</sup> This was the prelude to the non-cooperation movement.

---

1. Indian Annual Register 1920, pp. 460-462.

CHAPTER - III:

THE PROGRESS OF THE KHILAFAT MOVEMENT

The Progress of the Khilafat Movement:

The year 1920 opens with a definite cleavage between Indian political parties in Indian politics and also a clash between the Government and the Congress and the Khilafat organizations. The liberals or moderate elements had parted company with the Congress and formed a new organization of their own known as the Indian Liberal Federation in December 1919. In the Congress itself, the events that were fast developing themselves had created a further rift among the Congress men. At Amritsar, the central issue was working out or boycotting the new reforms. A few months after the new year had opened, the position of the different groups at Amritsar had been reversed. Gandhiji now stood for non-co-operation, and those who had opposed his policy of co-operation at Amritsar ranged themselves once again against him. The fact was that anxiety was growing in the public mind over the Punjab atrocities as well as the Khilafat question.<sup>1</sup>

The Khilafat movement which had begun in 1919 and remained confined to the advanced section of Muslims of India had now, had, leaped into the forefront of Indian politics and become a live force in 1920 after the release of

---

1. B.Pattabhi Sitaramayya: The History of the Indian National Congress Vol.1 P.189.

/ All Brothers ~~from their wartime internment~~ and now the Hindu-Muslim unity over Khilafat bore fruit in the shape of the adoption of Gandhi Ji's non-co-operation programme by both the Khilafatists as well as by the Indian National Congress after the publication of the much awaited and iniquitous terms of peace offered by the Allies to Turkey in May, 1920./

The events of 1920 centre round the Khilafat movement. During the course of the 1st Great World War, Mr. Lloyd George, the Premier of England, had made solemn promises to Indian Muslims who believing upon them had fought against their brothers in Islam. But when war came to a close, a curious interpretation had been put upon the promises, evidently to avoid fulfilment. If there was anything that exasperated the Indian Muslims, it was this perfidy of the British Premier. The pledges given by Lloyd George declared unequivocally in those words: "Nor are we fighting to deprive Turkey of the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor and Thrace which are predominantly Turkish in race." Similarly pledges about the Holy places of Islam and the Khilafat were made. These pledges were now unredeemed and the promises were heartlessly broken.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. B. Pattabhi Sitaramayya: The History of the Indian National Congress Vol. 1 p.189

Another factor or reason which went to make the Muslims still more anti British was the policy of the new Revolutionary or Bolshevik Government of Russia towards the then Muslim states.

"The Russian Soviet Government has given a subsidy of five million roubles in Gold to the 'League for the liberation of Islam'. There were branches of this league in all Islamic countries Turkey, Persia, Afghanistan and Egypt. This means that Russian Bolsheviks are making friends with Islam whose people are fallen. Now that means a tremendous force which would extend from Russia to the borders of India. Islam is essentially a democratic creed, and so the Islamic People would not find it difficult to embrace Bolshevism. Their kings would disappear, but there is nothing in Islam which makes Kingship a compulsory form of Government for its people. We do not know what is ahead of us; but we can see that there was much trouble and unrest and bloodshed ahead with this Union of Islam and Bolsheviks Russia. We at least wish that the end whatever it may be for the good of mankind."

---

1. Hindustan, Bombay (Weekly) 4th Jan. 1920 Eng. Cols. P. 22.



The Akhbar-e-Islam of Bombay was of the view that Indian National Congress had supplied a convincing testimony to Hindu-Muslim unity by taking up the Khilafat question and observed that the views expressed by the President of Congress in connection with this question generally represented the sentiments of Muslims at large. It emphasised the need of satisfactory settlement of the Turkish question and remarked that the loyal Muslims community should be satisfied by His Majesty's government in this matter in the same way as they were tried to give satisfaction to every Indian by issuing the proclamation announcing the Royal assent to the Reform act. It hoped that the desire of the Indians for a satisfactory settlement of the Turkish problem would soon be fulfilled.<sup>1</sup>

The strong opinions expressed by Muslim leaders on the Persian and Khilafat questions reflected or represented the opinion of the Muslim in general. Measures were suggested for establishing unity between Hindus and Muslims in general so that the popular movement against the Government might succeed. The measures suggested establishing unity between Hindus and Muslims were very far sighted these were adopted by the Muslims.<sup>2</sup>

- 
1. The Akhbar-e-Islam, (Bombay) 30th Dec. 1919.
  2. Bombay Samachar, 31st Dec., 1919.

The paper 'Political Bhomiyao' described how the greed for the territorial aggrandisement and such other selfish motives superseded all consideration of justice and morality at the peace conference and observed that the assurances and pledges given by Great Britain are still "hanging in the air". It was of this opinion that owing to the Khilafat question, the unfortunate disturbances that took place in India last April and the unsatisfactory condition of Indians in the colonies, the atmosphere in India was surcharged with disquiet and discontent at present. Indians were not in a position to participate in the enjoyment of the celebrations of the peace.<sup>1</sup>

The Great War had been waged to confer freedom on the whole of the world and especially on the weaker nationalities. But to the great disappointment of Indians in utter violation of this promise repressive measures in the form of Rowlatt act which went to curtail whatever civil liberty Indians enjoyed was passed. Still more deplorable had been the fate of the Turkish Empire, in as much as those very nations that engaged themselves in the great war to establish permanent peace in the world, on

---

1. Bhomiyao, Ahmedabad(Weekly) 26th December, 1919.

the noble principle of self determination, had, just after the war had a successful termination in their own favour, began to swallow that Empire.

President Wilson's fourteen points, at the declaration of which Turkey laid aside its arms, had disappeared. The principle of self-determination proudly avowed by all the liberal-minded nations had been somehow lost from view and, under the cover of full talks about freedom of nationalities and self-determination and the spread of civilization, the four great powers which had now achieved predominance in Europe were now busy in distributing the Turkish loot amongst themselves, freedom and self-determination existed <sup>only</sup> in name; the real aim was to secure respective self interest, <sup>come</sup> But Muslims began to/closer to their Hindu brethren. The Hindu-Muslim compact was first made in 1916; the Khilafet question; the Rowlatt Act and the Punjab massacre had so well cemented it there was no possibility of any future split. /

The hearts of all Muslims in the World are bent with the idea that the Turkish throne will be shattered to pieces and that the European nations will swallow the

Turkish territories while preaching deceitful philosophy and Persia will be ruined and that in short the name of Islam renowned for ages will go to ruin, Hindus will treat the Muslim's sorrow and calamity as their own<sup>1</sup>

The Turkish question had agitated greatly all Muslims in India and they are afraid whether the Sultan will lose his temporal power like the Pope of Rome. As France and England have come to a unanimous understanding regarding Turkey, the minds of Muslims have become disturbed. The Amritsar Congress has given this resolution as much importance as if it were its own question and the attempt of the congress has resulted in permanent unity between Hindus and Muslims<sup>2</sup>

The Muslim League had its annual meeting passed a resolution not to sacrifice Cows as far as possible. The Hindus expressed their gratitude to their Muslim brethren by holding meetings and passing resolutions of thanks giving.

Muslim Deputation to the Viceroy; January 19, 1920

In accordance with the decision arrived at the All  
of  
India Khilafat Conference/Amritsar, an influential and

- 
1. Loka Sangraha: (Poona) 6th January, 1920
  2. Kesari: Poona (Weekly) 6th January, 1920.

representative Muslims deputation which the Hindu leaders also joined, waited on the Viceroy on January 19, 1920 to place before him their views on the Khilafat question. The deputation consisted of about 35 persons and among them were included the Ali Brothers, who had taken a leading part in organizing it, Hakim Ajmal Khan, Dr. Ansari, Maulana Abdul Bari, Seth Chotani, Nasrat Mohani, Dr. Kitchlew and also Mahatma Gandhi, Pandit Madan Mohan Malviya and Swami Shradhdhanand. It presented a memorandum to Lord Chelmsford setting forth the demands not only of Muslim India but of the Indian public as a whole in regard to the Khilafat question. The deputation pointed out that though the war was over, peace was still distant and doubtful. It urged the Imperial authorities not to underrate the worth and value of Islamic friendship and Indian loyalty. A settlement not acceptable to <sup>Indian</sup> Muslims and non-Muslims would bring no peace because, the deputation asserted, it would bring no sense of justice and contentment. The deputation stated that Arabia, as delimited by Muslim authorities and the Holy places of Islam must remain under the control of the Khalifa, full guarantees being taken consistently

with the dignity of a sovereign state for genuine Arabic self-Government, should the Arabs desire it.

The deputation in the end asked for the sympathetic assistance of the Viceroy not only in conveying those views to the peace conference at Paris but also in facilitating the despatch to England of a deputation to apprise His Majesty's government with the feeling of the Muslims on the subject of peace with Turkey. The Viceroy's reply to the deputation was courteous and dignified. It avoided all controversies as far as possible and it expressed only empty sympathy for Muslims in their problems. But on the whole, it was disappointing and half hearted. The viceroy did not touch the main question and could give no assurance regarding the final disposal of the Turkish question. Except promising to provide full facilities to the Muslim deputation to Europe, he expressed his inability to do anything <sup>substantial</sup> in the matter.<sup>1</sup>

The Bengal Provincial Khilafat Conference was held at Calcutta under the Presidentship of Maulana Abul Kalam <sup>towards</sup> Azad ~~in~~ the end of February, 1920. It is important <sup>because of the scholarly</sup> account of two main reasons, firstly ~~the~~ Presidential

---

1. Indian Annual Register, 1921 pp.148-157  
Bombay Chronicle 21st Jan., 1920.

about the Khilafat question address delivered by Maulana Azad/and secondly the violent and forceful speech which was given by Maulana Abdul Bari.

In this address Maulana Azad contended that Khilafat was based on Shariat i.e. on the Quranic injunctions and the traditions of the Prophet and the purpose of the Quran in creating Khilafat on earth was to establish a responsible community and government for the protection guidance and welfare of mankind and to impart justice to all and to remove oppression from the face of the earth. Recognition of the Khalifa and submission to him was <sup>as</sup> obligatory as submission to God and his Apostle. Maulana Azad then <sup>advanced</sup> ~~gave~~/numerous arguments in support of the claims of the Sultan of Turkey to Khilafat and asserted that from the time of Sultan Salim upto the present day the Ottoman Sultan had been Khalifas of the entire Muslim World and during the centuries which had passed, not a single rival claimant had ever arisen against them.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. Mirza Abdul Qadir Beg: Khilafat and Jaziratul Arab (English translation of the Presidential address of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad delivered at the Bengal Provincial Khilafat Committee in Feb. 1920 pp. 302-305.

Maulana Abdul Bari compared the present position of Islam to that of a dying man. Muslims were like the family members who were filled with anxiety and they should be ready to do anything possible for patient.

In the past the Muslims had not shown enough sympathy with Islam and had they been true Muslims they should have been able to over come any difficulty with the assistance of God. As they had not supported the Khalifa in the last war, they had committed a sin and consequently their prayers now were of no avail. All Muslims would die some day but if they wanted to die a Muslim death as distinct from the death of an infidel, as ever Muslim desired, they must work for the cause of Islam and should not waste time in delivering speeches. Having excited the feelings of his audience by references to the woes of the Khilafat and having urged them to die for their religion, Abdul Bari pointed out that even though Indian Muslims had no fire arms or weapons of war, they could well make use of bricks and that if each Muslim in India were to throw a handful of dust, they would bury their enemies in India. The speech was loudly applauded by the audience by the shouts of "Allah-oh-Akbar" and a large



number of persons who were sitting in the neighbourhood of Abdul Bari approached him and kissed his hands.<sup>1</sup>

This Conference also passed a number of resolutions, the most important of which was to the effect that the Muslims of India would abandon loyalty to the government if the decision of the peace conference with regard to Turkey went against their wishes.<sup>2</sup>

The final words of the Khilafat deputation ought to weigh with the Allies and a fair, just and honest settlement with Turkey should be made. The situation was grave; let it not be minimised or made light of. The true statement was he who saw the coming cloud and adjust his line of action accordingly. And discussion of Muslims loyalty, whatever be the fate of Turkey, was as unequalled for as it is unjust. The conference fervently trusted that such a situation would never arise and that Britain would strain every nerve to conclude a just and honourable settlement with Turkey in recognition of the unquestioned loyalty of Muslims to the King Emperor.<sup>3</sup>

- 
1. Confidential Report on the non-co-operation and Khilafat Movement in India by Deputy Director, Central Intelligence Bureau-Home Department Govt. of India pp.240-242.
  2. Praja Mitra and Parsi (Bombay) 10th March, 1920.
  3. Bombay Chronicle 22nd January, 1920.

of Bombay wrote  
Akbar Islam/that the Ali Brothers were real patriots  
and true servant of Islam. Inspite of the grave  
injustice done to them by Government they had not uttered  
a single word of complaint and had set about doing work  
in the service of Islam. It welcomed Ali Brothers and  
Maulana Bari and prayed that they might be spared long  
to serve Islam. In the subsequent issue the same paper  
referred to the enthusiastic reception given to the Ali  
Brothers and Maulana Bari in Bombay and while noting  
with pleasure the part played by Hindus in according  
welcome to these guests remarks; constant cries of Hindu  
Muslim Ki Jai were heard during the procession which  
lasted for three hours. This unity was a bright augury  
for the future of India. The resolution passed by the  
Muslim league in connection with the Cow slaughter and  
the advocacy of Maulana Abdul Bari the matter had captured  
the heart of Indians. The policy of "Divide and rule"  
inaugurated by Lord Dufferin induced the officials to  
resort to many reprehensible ways, but the sum total of  
of all their actions had been that the Hindus and Muslims  
had at length been convinced of the necessity of unity  
for its own sake and for securing the good government  
of the country.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. Akhbar-e-Islam (Bombay) January 29, 31, 1920.  
Vartaman (Bombay) January 29, 30, 1920.  
Prajā Mitra and Parsi (Bombay) January 30, 1920.

It should be specially noted that the Hindus sympathised with the Muslims in the Khilafat question because they were afraid that if once Muslim feelings were ignored their own feelings also might be set at naught in future. The fate of the Muslims was hanging in the balance. The Mufid-e-Rozgar of Bombay published a poem regarding the Khilafat in which the poet exhorted the Muslims to continue their efforts for the protection and defence of Khilafat and to obliterate all their differences. The poet concluded with a prayer to the Prophet to show mercy to the Muslims whose boat was tossing about on the sea of misfortune. In another place the paper wrote that Europe, which boasted of being just, was intoxicated with the wine of selfishness, so much so that it had lost all reason and statesmanship. In yet another issue the paper remarked that the peace conference was deliberately delaying the Turkish settlement and stated that there was no one in the conference conversant with the history of Islam otherwise he would have known that the Muslims had risen after every fall. It said that the Turks, during their long rule of 300 years, had never styled themselves kings of the Hejaz; they had always called themselves' servants of the Holy Haram', while,

on the contrary, Shareef Husain in his usurpation and temporary possession of the Hejaz, called himself king of the land.<sup>1</sup>

Hartal and boycott of English goods were suggested at the Calcutta conference and preparations were being made to observe both throughout India. Boycott had proved to be an effective weapon in emergency to open the eyes of the obstinate British. We must therefore take a view of Swadeshi and boycott and help our Muslim brothers in arresting the attention of the British people to their sores.

It is true that Mahatma Gandhi was not in favour of boycott. But he was in favour of non-cooperation with the officials. He, therefore, advised all who held offices of honour or emolument to give them up.

In our opinion this non-cooperation was nothing but boycott applied in an particular field.<sup>2</sup>

Boycott of British goods would operate economically, boycott of offices administratively. In effect both were potent but the former was more so as it touched primarily more quickly the pocket and so the heart of the Englishmen at home. As boycott and non-cooperation were more effective remedies than the pen and the tongue, they should be relied upon first.

---

1. Mufid Rozgar (Bombay) 8th Feb., 1920.

The Non-Co-Operation Programme :

The 19th March, 1920 which had been fixed as day of Hartal by the Central Khilafat Committee was to be observed by the Hindus as if it was a religious injunction and all the bussiness should be suspended<sup>on</sup>/that day. This is a constitutional movement and we fully hope that people all over India will co-operate in the matter.

Mahatma Gandhi has asked the people to refrain from all co-operation with the British government if it is going to reject the just demands of Muslims and he has urged Government servants to give up their posts and title holders their titles. The Calcutta Muslims have already stopped trading with England in response to the boycott resolution of the Khilafat conference. Boycott is a sharp but legitimate weapon and all think that it can be put to use,<sup>and</sup> it will prove most fruitful, for unless the nose is pressed the mouth would not be opened.<sup>1</sup>

✓ The Khilafat movement aims at no revolt or revolution; it only asks for justice to the claims of the Muslim world and its spiritual head -- the Khalifa - Sultan.

---

1. Lokasangraha: (Poona) 14th March 1920 and Indu Prakash (Bombay) 11th March, 1920.

The Central Khilafat Committee met at Bombay on the 11th of April, 1920 and resolutions were passed about sending further deputation to Europe and Mesopotamia and confining action for the time being to propaganda. It was, however, also decided that when further action should become necessary it should take the form of withdrawal from cooperation with the British Government, step by step in the order shown in the following plan which was drawn up by a special committee under Gandhi Ji's leadership.

- (1) All titles and honours to be relinquished.
- (2) Resignations by the members of legislative councils
- (3) Members of legal profession i.e. Vakils, Advocates, and Baristers to give up their practices.
- (4) Private servants to give<sup>up</sup> their posts. Resignations of sub-ordinate government servants including the Police.
- (5) Resignations of superior government servants
- (6) Withdrawal of Muslims from the army
- (7) Refusal to pay taxes.

On the 12th of May 1920 an urgent meeting of the Central Khilafat Committee again took place at Bombay to deliberate

---

upon the programme of the non-cooperation movement. From meanwhile, news reached India foreshadowing the Turkish peace terms which were considered to be very humiliating, harsh and unjust, and Jihad, Hijrat and non-cooperation were in the air.

Representatives of the Khilafat committee all over India were present. Mr. Chotani opened the proceedings and explained the position into which Indian Muslims had been driven and wanted to have a referendum on the momentous question of non-cooperation. Mahatma Gandhi, who also attended, again emphasised that the only course now left open to the Muslims was to adopt non-cooperation<sup>towards the government.</sup> He said that he was willing to sacrifice himself, his wife and children for the sacred cause. He impressed on all, the importance of non-violence and was able to persuade Ali Brothers and their followers to give non-cooperation a full and fair trial. As a result of this meeting a sub-Committee consisting of Messrs. Chotani, Gandhiji, Abul Kalam Azad, Shaukat Ali and Ahmad Siddiqi Khatri was appointed to organize the non-cooperation movement.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. Indian Annual Register, 1921, p.103.

In the beginning the Shias were not with the Sunnis in the matter of the demand about the Khilafat and the Holy places of Islam. Efforts were made to get their co-operation in the Khilafat movement and to exhort them to support the Muslim cause and to work for Muslims.

A resolution was passed by the Shias of Bombay protesting against the declaration of the Shia conference and Maulana Nasir Husain Sahib, the Mujtahid of Lucknow, which was against the Khilafat movement. A Fatwa of the great divines of Kerbala and Najaf was put before them whose authority was supreme and unquestioned in the Shia world calling upon their followers to stand shoulder to shoulder /with their Sunni brethren in the defence of the temporal powers of the Sunni Khalifa and the Holy land which is common both to shias and Sunnis.<sup>1</sup> On account of this fatwa the overwhelming majority of Indian Shia Muslims supported this movement.

Never in the History of the World had any group of mortals such great power and opportunity of doing real good to humanity as the Allied Statesmen had at San Remo and Versailles, and never was that power so abused and

---

1. Muslim Out Look: London, May 20th, 1920.



that opportunity so recklessly cast aside as by the Allied Statesmen at San Remo.' The Turkish "Peace" Treaty was formally handed over to the Turkish delegates on May 11th, and was published in India on the 15th May, 1920.

The essential provisions of the proposed terms were:- retention of Sultan at Constantinople, the right of the Allies to occupy European Turkey and the Straits; the creation of an Armenian State with access to the sea; abandonment by Turkey of Syria, Palestine, Mesopotamia, Arabia and the Aegean Islands, Grant to Greece of the right to administer Smyrna for five years while the territory remained under the nominal Turkish sovereignty and at the end of this a plebiscite was to be taken to determine its final disposition. A number of Turkish parts were to be internationalised and the Sultan's army and the navy was to be strictly limited. The peace terms were accompanied by a message from the Viceroy to the Muslim of India and an explanatory statement by the Government of India, which meant to convince the Muslims of the justice and wisdom of the settlement and to give them some consolation.

It was said that in the fair name of self-determination, justice and liberty, <sup>treaty</sup> the/faithfully carried out all the provisions of the secret treaties regarding the partition of Turkey.

"As a document embodying an honest attempt to establish the reign of justice and good will in the world it is extremely disappointing. As a redemption of the solemn pledges given by the Allies to their Muslim subjects it is shocking. The treaty, in short, is a monument of hypocrisy and the blackest breach of faith. Having won, through the sacrifices of their Muslim soldiers, their present position of dominance, the Allies, like the ungrateful monster of Shakespeare, Caliban, now turn round to the Muslims and say." You have given us power and we know how to crush your most cherished religious sentiments". The effect that this betrayal and breach of faith is bound to produce on the credit of the Allies in the East in general, and in the Muslim world in particular.<sup>1</sup> The treaty is, in fact, a declaration of policy so uncompromising as to amount to a declaration of war upon Islam and Asia. England had

---

1. Muslim Outlook: London, May 20th, 1920.

definitely rejected the path of reconciliation which the fall of Czarist Russia opened to her and chooses the way of oppression.<sup>1</sup>

Numerous public protest meetings were held throughout the length and breadth of India urging upon the Government of India to use its influence on the Home Government so as to revise the peace terms in a manner compatible to Muslim feelings of religion and honour. The terms of the proposed treaty were severely condemned and Great Britain was attacked for being a party to them. The most important of these meetings was the one which was held at Bombay on 28th May, 1920 under the auspices of the Central Khilafat Committee under the Presidentship of Mr. Chotani, at which <sup>the</sup> non-cooperation resolution was passed as the only practical line of action. In pursuance of its doctrines, Hakim Ajmal Khan of Delhi, Mr. Chotani of Bombay, Mr. Yakub Hassan of Madras and Maulana Fakhir of Allahabad and many other notable Muslims renounced and returned titles and honorary posts under the government and withdrew all cooperation with the Government.<sup>2</sup> The Council of All India Muslim League from Lucknow sent a

---

1. Muslim out-look: London, May 20th, 1920.<sup>1</sup>

2. Indian Annual Register, 1921, p.193.

cable to the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for India, indignantly protesting against the peace terms offered to Turkey as they were not only grossly unjust and intolerable in themselves and more vindictive than those imposed upon any other state lately warring with the Allied powers there were also clear violation of Solemn pledges of the British Government particularly those made at the beginning of the war regarding the Holy places of Islam and later on regarding Thrace and Asia Minor.<sup>1</sup> Mr. Gandhi issued a statement in which he described the terms of treaty as a staggering blow for Indian Muslims.

The publication of the proposed peace terms caused the deepest indignation, and synchronising as it did with the publication of the Hunter Committee's report, the whole country was ablaze. The Khilafat Committee met at Bombay to deliberate upon Gandhi's non-cooperation programme and adopted it on 28th May, 1920,<sup>and</sup> on the 30th May, 1920, the All India Congress Committee met at Banaras to discuss the Hunter report and the Turkish peace terms

---

1. Indian Annual Register, 1921, p.201.

and after a long debate decided to hold a special session of the Congress to consider the question of non-cooperation. > The Hunter report was published on the 28th May, 1920 and its findings filled the country with feelings of resentment and disgust. The report was not unanimous, the Indian members differed from the English. The difference centred round the issue whether the outbreak of trouble in the Punjab was a premeditated revolt or an accidental outburst. The English members took the former view and the Indian the later. According the later martial law was not called for. They put down the responsibility of the trouble at O'Dwyer's 'Zulum' in collecting money and recruiting soldiers. They took government to task for suppressing news which gave rise to rumours and grave misunderstanding. The Government accepted the view that "Misuse of power, by irregularity and by injudicious and irresponsible acts; that General Dwyer acted beyond what any reasonable man could have thought it necessary, and that he did not act with such humanity as the case permitted". His Majesty's government also expressed strong disapproval of certain specified instances of undue severity and of improper punishment and orders during the Martial Law regime, and

instructed the Government of India to see that this approval was unmistakably marked by censure or other action upon officers responsible for them.<sup>1</sup>

✓ At the end of May, 1920 the central Khilafat Committee issued a manifesto asking the people of India to withdraw cooperation from the Government until justice was done to Turkey.

It was about this time that Gandhiji put forward the programme of non-cooperation with the British Government, which was mainly concerned at this time with the Khilafat movement. It was<sup>presented before</sup> a conference of leaders of all parties which met at Allahabad in the 2nd June, 1920.

At this conference the policy of non-cooperation was decided upon and a committee was appointed composed of Gandhi and some Muslim leaders, to draw up the detailed programme. The Committee published its programme which comprised the boycott of all Government and all Government aided schools and colleges and educational institutions, law courts and the giving up of Government services. The All India Khilafat Conference held at Delhi as early as in November, 1919, had already decided to withdraw cooperation

---

1. Sitaramayya B. Pattabhi. The History of the Indian National Congress Vol. 1 pp. 196-198

from Government under Gandhi's advice, a decision which was reaffirmed by a number of Muslim meetings held in Calcutta as well as by the Madras Khilafat Conference held on 17th April, 1920, where the progressive detailed programme of Non-cooperation had been drawn up. It included the renunciation of Government titles and posts under Government, both civil and military, honorary posts and membership of the legislative councils and non payment of taxes. The situation became acute. The 'Triveni' of the Khilafat and the Punjab wrong and the invisible flow of inadequate Reforms had become full to the brim and by their confluence enriched both in volume and content the stream of national discontent. Every thing was ripe for Non-cooperation.<sup>1</sup>

In the meantime some zealous Muslims embarked upon a plan of Hijrat (migration) to Afghanistan as they felt they could not stay in India under the British after the peace which had been imposed on Turkey and which was in utter violation of past categorical assurances, and because the Government had made it difficult for pious Muslims to live in India on account of its satanic laws.

The movement started in Sindh and spread to the N.W.F.P.

---

1. Sitarameyya B.Pattabhi: The History of the Indian National Congress pp.198-99.

This was just to imitate the example of their Holy Prophet Mohammed who performed Hijrat from Mecca to Medina when it became intolerable for him to live islamically at the former place. The Prophet had exhorted his followers only to migrate <sup>to</sup> Medina and else where, where they could live and pray in peace.

This movement was the direct result of the Khilafat programme and was stimulated by the speech of the Amir of Afghanistan to the effect that he was prepared to offer an asylum to Indian Muslims if they left India on grounds of religion. Hijrat committees and Mahajrin Offices started springing up in different parts of the country in the month of June, 1920. They were meant to make arrangements for the lodging, boarding and travelling of the people to emigrate from India. The movement soon assumed huge proportions and threatened to be a whole sale migration of population from the North-West Frontier Provinces to Afghanistan. About 18000 people, animated in a high degree by a religious enthusiasm, moved in the direction of Afghanistan in the month of August, 1920, apparently imagining that having got there they would be maintained at the expense of the Amir for the rest of their lives. The total number of



emigrants was estimated between 500,000 and 2000,000 by various observers.<sup>1</sup>

At first Afghanistan looked upon this emigration with some thing like a favour and the Mahajrins were welcomed by the Government and the people of that country and all sorts of help was provided to them. But before long the immense scale upon which the movement was pursued rendered it necessary for the Afgan authorities, whose country was poor and comparatively sterile, to forbid altogether the admission of migrants. As a result, the tide of emigrants slowly ebbed and sadly disillusioned, they ultimately struggled back to India their former home. The road from Peshawar to Kabul was strewn with graves of old men, women and children who had succumbed to the hardships of the Journey. Anti-social elements in Afghanistan even looted the Mahajrines and deprived many of them of all their possessions.<sup>2</sup>

At the Sind Khilafat Conference which was held in July, 1920 inflammatory speeches inciting people to resort to Jihad against the Government were made by Khilafat leader: ~~Hussain Ahmad Hanafi, Maulana Mohammed Ali, Shariat Ali and others.~~ Similar speeches were made at different places like Amritsar and Lahore by the Muslim Leaders.

---

1. Briggs: The Indian Hijrat of 1920, Muslim World, Vol. XX No.2 (April 1930) p.165.

2. Indu Prakash (Bombay) 6th October, 1920

Non-cooperation Programme was explained to the masses along with its implications. Mahatma Gandhi also made a strong speech with Muslim leaders at a number of places in Northern India. Reports from Bengal indicated that the excitement which was aroused there by the Khilafat workers was so intense that even they had begun to fear it was getting beyond their control. A very tragic result of the agitation was the murder of Mr. R.W.D. Willoughby, I.C.S. Deputy Commissioner in the United Provinces.<sup>1</sup> Gandhiji's doctrine was to oppose brute force with soul force or passive resistance. He moved a resolution which had been adopted by the All India Khilafat Conference, which said that if the problems were not solved consistently with the pledges of His Majesty's Ministers, then in the event of an adverse decision being arrived at, it would be the duty of every Indian to withdraw cooperation from the Government until the pledges are fulfilled and Muslim sentiments conciliated.<sup>2</sup>

---

1. Government of India: India in 1920 p. 53.

2. Muslim outlook: 3rd June, 1920.

Gandhiji described the Khilafat question as the question of questions and Lala Lajpat Rai had drawn attention to the national duty of focussing and consolidating Indian opinion on it and of pressing it on the British people for consideration. He said: "It was not a question that affected the Muslims only. It was one that affected every Asiatic and every Indian, may every human being,"<sup>1</sup>

Gandhiji's suggestion about non-cooperation with Government was made on account of the decision of the San Remo Conference with regard to Turkey:- Said he "Non-cooperation is fraught with practical difficulties of a most serious character. Even if started, far from being a course of strong action, it will have all the weakness and fury of impotency. The wrong to Turkey had better be left to be righted by the great invisible moral forces of the World. No international wrong can be perpetuated. There is bound to be re-adjustment sooner or later. Because Turkey has been unjustly dealt with there should be hartals and suspension of Civil Government in India, is neither sound logic nor practical politics. It cannot command larger support, and it can bring about the desired end. The only remedy for international

---

1. Bombay Chronicle 9th April, 1920.

immorality is war; War being out of question, the method of peace, which Gandhiji advocates, are impotent and useless. They can, with all his insistence on nonviolence, only lead to eruptions of violence and mad fury.<sup>1</sup>"

Ultimatum Sent by the Khilafat Committee to His Excellency the Viceroy

An ultimatum had been given to the Viceroy by the Khilafat Committee in these words on 22nd June 1920." We shall withhold cooperation from him if he did not support our cause. If the terms of the Turkish "Peace" are not modified on the lines of Indian Muslims demand, by July 31st, 1920." We ask your Excellency not to regard our statement as threat or in any way as a mark of disrespect. We claim to be as loyal subjects of the Crown as any in India. But we consider our loyalty to an earthly sovereign to be subservient to our loyalty to Islam. The matter enjoins upon every Muslim to ~~consider those who want twenty thousand people~~ adopt non-cooperation as the only means of securing revision

---

1. Praja Mitra and Parsi:- (Bombay) 1st May, 1920

of the terms of Turkish Treaty." Numerous meetings  
held / <sup>throughout</sup> the length and breadth of the country demanded  
the recall of Indian troops from all the Islamic  
countries and a postponement of the Prince of Wales' visit. It  
was said at these meetings that this was an extreme step  
against Government which was proud of the glory of  
Amritsar and Gujranwalla, of Cawnpur and Calcutta dripping  
with the innocent blood of those peaceful citizens whom  
over the Sanctuary of a mosque could not save. But this  
was the only step left. Muslims had exhausted every  
other means possible. They pleaded, entreated, appealed  
to the sense of justice and human instincts of the  
Government, reminded it of its solemn pledges and lofty  
promises of its war aims; they demonstrated, expressed  
their resentment and even convinced the Government of the  
genuineness and intensity of popular Muslim feelings on  
the point. But the Government proved impervious to all  
these appeals and persuasions. The Government refused  
to renounce its immoral design, treating its solemn  
proclamations and declarations as mere scrap of paper.  
They approached the British Cabinet and appealed to the  
British People but met with no better result. It could not

be said that Muslims were hasty or unreasonable in their fateful decision. The entire responsibility of the struggle that must have opened on August 1, 1920, therefore rests on the Government of India and the British Cabinet.<sup>1</sup>

Non-cooperation programme in operation

A Conference of Hindus and Muslims was held on November 24, 1919 at Delhi to consider the Khilafat question prior to the Amritsar session of the congress. Gandhiji attended it by special invitation. The conference discussed what steps could be taken if the Government did not do justice on this question.

A resolution came up in the conference on the adoption of Swadeshi and boycott of foreign cloth. Opposing this, Maulana Hasrat Mohani brought up the question of boycott of British goods. Gandhiji explained to the audience that boycott of British goods was not possible and it would engender a sense of revenge too. And he explained to the conference the resolution on the boycott of foreign cloth and, in accordance with his

---

1. Muslim outlook: (London) August 5th, 1920.

suggestion, a resolution to that effect was passed by the conference. Expressing his dissatisfaction, he said that they must talk about something that would directly affect the Government.

As Gandhiji was listening to the Maulana's speech, the idea of non-cooperation suddenly occurred to him. He held that to consider how to affect the Government while cooperating with it was useless and if they wished to offer such opposition, that would be possible only by withdrawing co-operation from the Government. Hence after the Maulana concluded his speech, in reply to it Gandhi presented this idea and said, "The Musalman brethren have taken an more important decision. God forbid it, but if possibly the peace terms go against them, they may stop co-operation with the Government I believe this is right of subjects." This fact about the birth of the idea of non-cooperation is important and deserves mention.<sup>1</sup>

The campaign had two aspects: constructive and destructive. In the pursuance of the former, it was decided to raise a fund of one crore of Rupees in the memory Lokamanya Tilak

---

1. 1921 Movement: Reminiscences, p.39 published by Government of India.

who had died on August 1st, 1920 to finance the non-cooperation movement, to enrol a volunteer corps of one crore members to help in the promotion of the various boycotts, social, educational, legal and economic, and to distribute twenty lakh spinning wheels to provide work for the unemployed or under employed and to replace foreign cloth by hand made Indian cloth.

In regard to the latter, the important items were: (1) the boycott of the law courts by the lawyers who would set up popular tribunals for administering justice; (2) the boycott of schools and colleges owned or aided or recognised by the Government and the establishment of national educational institutions; (3) the boycott of elections to the assembly and the provincial councils; (4) the surrender of honours, titles etc., and the boycott of official functions; (5) the boycott of British goods and the encouragement of Swadeshi, especially Khaddar or home-spun, home-woven cloth; and (b) the prohibition of drinking liquor.<sup>1</sup>

The country was profoundly stirred and an unprecedented wave of enthusiasm ran through India's teeming

---

1. 1921 Movement: Reminiscences, p.25.



millions. Unparalleled scenes of fervour, devotion and sacrifice were witnessed everywhere, Lawyers of the distinction Motilal Nehru, C.R. Das, Rajendra Prasad, Mazharul Haque, Syed Mahmud, T.A.K. Sherwani and A.M. Khuwaja Rajagopalachari/surrendered their highly profitable practice; thousands of students came out of colleges and schools, and many national institutions were founded where teachers worked on a pittance. A number of students of the Aligarh University left their studies at the bidding Mohammed Ali and founded the Jamia Millia Islamia which later shifted to Delhi. Subhash Chandra Bose resigned his post in the Indian civil service and worked as Principal of the National College at Calcutta. Jawahar Lal Nehru bade adieu to the Allahabad High Court and was drawn into the whirlpool of non-cooperation. He gave expression to feelings which moved the non-cooperation in these words.

"Many of us who worked for the Congress Programme lived in a kind of intoxication during the year 1921. We were full of excitement and optimism and a buoyant enthusiasm. We sensed the happiness of person crusading for a cause ..... Above all, we had a sense of freedom and a pride in that freedom. The old feeling of oppression and frustration was completely gone."<sup>1</sup>

---

1. 1921 Movement: Reminiscences pp.25-26.

From August 1, 1920 when it started to February 6, 1922 when it was suspended, the non-cooperation campaign moved in crescendo. The educational boycott was quite effective in the beginning. The number of students in colleges was reduced from 52482 in 1919-20 to 45933 in 1921-22 and in secondary schools from 1281810 in 1919-20 to 1239524 in 1921-22. But to provide for the education of the large numbers involved was a difficult job and although many colleges and schools were established, many could not be accommodated and had to go back to their institutions. Similar was the case with the legal profession. Because of lack of alternative employment for persons who had to maintain families, it was not possible for a large number to give up their only means of livelihood. But in cases against the non-cooperators, the accused refused to participate and put up no defense in the trial courts. So far as the boycott of elections was concerned, the politicians of the moderate liberal school and sundry others had made up their minds to stand for the councils. The Congress abstained from voting but demonstrated quite convincingly its hold upon the electorate, and exposed the unrepresentative character of those elected.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. 1921 Movement: Reminiscences pp.26-27.

It also included the renunciation of honours or favours, titles, sanads and seat in the council etc. by the people from all parts of India chiefly by Muslims. The effect of the boycott of foreign cloth was felt throughout India. It attained considerable success in Bengal, Bombay, Madras and the United Provinces (Uttar Pradesh).

Regarding the boycott of liquor during the year 1921-22 the excise reports of most provinces showed that it had considerable effect in reducing excise revenue. In the Punjab, Bihar and Orissa and Bombay, the reduction was respectively 33, 10 and 6 lakhs of rupees<sup>1</sup>. It is not possible to narrate all the incidents of this amazing campaign of twenty month in which the Hindus and Muslims worked shoulder to shoulder for the dual cause of Khilafat and Swaraj. But some are noteworthy. In June 1920 Maulana Abdul Bari of Lucknow issued a Fatwa signed by many divines declaring India to be Dar-al-Harb, which presented to the Muslims with the alternative of Jihad (holy war) or hijrat (emigration). This was reiterated in

---

1. 1921 Movement: Reminiscences, p.27.

the  
November 1920, as/mutaffiq fatwa (joint decree). It is estimated that nearly 18,000 Muslims mostly from Sind and the North-West Frontier Provinces left for Afghanistan. The Afghan authorities refused to admit them, and they had to return homeless and miserable.<sup>1</sup>

By July 1921, the non-cooperation movement had thoroughly roused the country, but had made little impression upon the British rulers in so far <sup>as</sup> settlement of the Khilafat question was concerned.<sup>1</sup> The result was that frustration and bitterness rose high. The All India Khilafat conference which met at Karachi on July 8, therefore, called upon the Muslims soldiers of the Indian army to abandon service as it was religiously unlawful. For this Mohammad Ali, Shaukat Ali, Maulana Husain Ahmad Madni, Dr. Kitchew and Pir Ghulam Mujaddid were arrested September 14 and prosecuted Gandhi then issued a manifesto, saying, "it is contrary to national interest for any Indian to serve as a civilian, and more especially as soldier, under Government."<sup>2</sup>

---

1. 1921 Movement: Reminiscences p.27.

2. Ibid.

The next step was to obtain the approval and ratification of the Congress for non-cooperation. A special session of the organisation was, therefore, summoned in Calcutta on September 4, 1920. Meanwhile Gandhiji, Shaukat Ali, Mohammad Ali and other leaders toured extensively the country, rousing people's enthusiasm and laying stress upon Hindu-Muslim unity. The Congress met under the chairmanship of Lala Lajpat Rai. About 30,000 delegates attended and among them a large number were Muslims. Gandhiji moved the following resolution which in its preamble narrated the history of the Khilafat question and the failure of all efforts to secure a satisfactory solution:

" This congress is further of opinion that there is no course left open for the people of India but to approve of and adopt the policy of progressive nonviolent non-cooperation until the said wrongs are righted and Swaraj is established."<sup>1</sup>

The session was to take a decision about the implementation of this programme. Gandhiji's resolution was finally adopted after a strenuous debate both in the

---

1. 1921 Movement: Reminiscences, p.21.

subjects Committee and in the open congress. Many of the leaders, notably C.R. Das from Bengal, Lajpat Rai from Punjab, Annie Besant and Mohammad Ali Jinnah, all opposed it and only Pandit Moti Lal Nehru sided with Gandhiji. The bitterest opposition to, Gandhiji's approach came from the followers of Tilak. The President Lala Lajpat Rai then delivered his address which was listened to with rapt attention. The Lala also urged the recall of the Viceroy. Regarding the Khilafat movement, he said that Hindus should give unreserved, unhesitating moral and constitutional support to Muslims in their Khilafat agitation. The Congress then adjourned for the meeting of the subjects Committee. The debate in the Committee centred principally on the subject of non-cooperation.<sup>1</sup>

The special week was availed of for convening a session of the Khilafat Conference at Calcutta. The Conference was held at the Congress Pandal on the 5th September, 1920. Delegates from all parts of India were present: besides Muslim leaders and Ulama, a number of Hindu leaders also attended. In the absence of

---

1. The Indian Review 1920, p.580.

Shoikh-ul-Hind Maulana Mahmoodul Hasan the Conference was presided by Maulana Abdul Wajid of Nadan. The President in his address dwelt on the importance of the institution of Khilafat and the religious obligation binding on Indian Muslims under the circumstances. He said Government was meant to defend the rights of people and do justice to them but the British Government had failed to perform the sacred duties of a Government in the matter of Khilafat and Punjab affairs. Non-cooperation, he said, was a religious duty which Indian Muslims should perform in defence of their faith. Then followed the resolution on non-cooperation which was moved by Maulvi Sayed Hassain. The resolution runs:- "This Conference declares with certainty of belief that non-cooperation is a religious obligation binding on all Muslims of India and they should therefore carry out this religious duty most successfully and devotedly with united effort in connection with Khilafat movement."

✓ A number of other resolutions were also passed touching Hindu Muslim unity, the Egyptian independence and other subjects. At the conclusion Maulana Abul Kalam Azad made a brief appeal to the audience to translate all resolutions into action and trust in God for success.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. Indian Review 1920, p.584.

The annual session of the Indian National Congress held under the Presidentship of the Congress leader of the South Mr. C. Vijayaraghavachariar, was again the scene of another notable triumph for Mahatma Gandhi. He not only succeeded in securing the confirmation of his non-cooperation programme but in addition he was able to get the old creed of the Congress altered. It meant the total abandonment of adherence to that body to the British connection and to constitutional methods of agitation. The object of the congress was now declared to be the attainment of Swaraj by peaceful and legitimate means.<sup>1</sup> The whole session of the congress was marked by Mahatma Gandhi's personal ascendancy on the organisation. The annual session of the All India Muslim League and the All India Khilafat Conference were also held at Nagpur under the Presidentship of Dr. H.A. Ansari and Maulana Abdoul Hajid Patauni respectively. Besides confirming the non-cooperation programme, the Muslim League passed the resolution asking the Amir of Afghanistan to refrain from making any treaty with Great Britain, as it would be used by the

---

1. Indian National Congress 1920 to 1923 p.38.



English to strengthen their hold on India. ]The Khilafat Conference passed a number of resolutions relating to the Khilafat movement and the programme of non-cooperation. In the first resolution it reaffirmed its former decision to carry on constant agitation against the peace terms to the last until the spiritual and the temporal status of the Khilafat was restored 'status quo ante bellum. In the second resolution the Khilafat Conference protested against the policy adopted by the British Government with regard to the Islamic countries in general and Turkey and Mesopotamia in particular. In the third resolution it expressed sorrow at the helpless condition of the Khilafat-ul-Muslimin and in the fourth it offered its heart-felt sympathy to those Indian Muslims who had already performed and were willing to perform Hijrat as a religious duty for the preservation and glorification of their faith.<sup>1</sup>

The non-cooperation movement in India had caused some stir in the political atmosphere of England. Some British publicists felt the necessity of paying heed to the Indian grievances and arriving at some

---

1. Indian Annual Register, 1921, pp. 238, 239, 240.

satisfactory compromise with India lest she should burst into flame like Ireland.<sup>1</sup>

Since the passing of the non-cooperation resolution at Calcutta special congress, India had been divided into three distinct political parties.

/ The first was the party of the Nationalists who gave their staunch adhesion to the programme of non-cooperation, the second while giving their adhesion to the principle, were prepared to follow out the programme only as far as it would be practicable and effective and the third consisted of the Moderates and Pro-Government people.<sup>2</sup>

The non-cooperation policy was as one of self control cum renunciation and interalia states.

Now that the Nagpur session had, unlike the Calcutta Congress, summoned every class and community to respond to the nation's call, there was no ground for complaint that a particular section was left out of consideration. The response of the people was ample. Students, Lawyers, merchants all joined the movement contributed to the success of the movement,

---

1. Maharashtra 22nd December, 1920.

2. Maharashtra 5th January, 1921, Young Patriot 3rd January, 1921.

The Congress resolution was strongly supported by a fatwa (religious decree) issued by Jamiatul-Ulema-e-Hind calling upon the Muslims to boycott elections, Government schools and Colleges and law courts, and to renounce titles and ranks conferred by the Government. The decree was signed nearly 900 Ulema.<sup>1</sup> The Viceroy declared that the policy of non-cooperation must inevitably lead to disorder and asked whether anything could be more futile or illadvised. He finally characterised the movement as the "most foolish of all foolish schemes."<sup>2</sup>

By the end of December 1921 most of the prominent leaders, except Gandhi, were imprisoned. Twenty thousand political prisoners filled the jails. At the highest point of the struggle i.e. at the beginning of the year, 1922 30,000 were in jail. Enthusiasm was at fever heat.<sup>3</sup>

- 
1. 1921 Movement: Reminiscences, pp.21-22.
  2. Sitaramayya B.Pattabhi: The History of the Indian National Congress Vol(1) p.199.
  3. Dutt, R. Palme: India today p.284.

Progress of Non-Co-operation movement in educational Institutions:

The progress of the non-co-operation movement can be gauged from the rapid awakening of the student world. The minds of the students have been strongly stirred up and the Muslim students of Aligarh responded to the non-cooperation movement.<sup>1</sup> The number of students in Colleges was reduced from 52482 in 1919-20 to 45933 in 1921-22, and in Secondary Schools from 1281810 in 1919-20 to 1239524 in 1921-22.<sup>2</sup>

In October, 1920 the Ali Brothers, Hakim Ajmal Khan and Gandhiji jointly<sup>decided</sup> and tried to induce the trustees of the Mohamadan Anglo Oriental College to give up the Government grant in aid and cut off all relations with the Government which was sinful and unjust and that the political disease from which India was suffering could not be cured without paralysing that Government.

They addressed the students of the College and called upon them to leave the College. The efforts of Ali brothers finally succeeded and about 600 students

- 
1. Baroda Vartman: 1st November, 1920.
  2. 1921 Movement : Reminiscences, p.26.

responded to the call of non-cooperation very enthusiastically and decided to abstain from attending their classes.<sup>1</sup> When the trustees of the College refused to agree to the demands of the non-cooperationist leaders, a rival institution was set up near the old College. Hakim Ajmal Khan of Delhi and Haji Musa Khan of Aligarh were elected President and Secretary respectively of the foundation committee of the University. Maulana Mohammed Ali was appointed as the first Principal of the College, but as his attention was chiefly devoted to carrying on the Khilafat agitation, he relinquished the post and was replaced by Abdul Majid Khuwaja, Barrister-at-law Aligarh.<sup>2</sup>

The Hindu University of Banaras also received the attention of the leaders who endeavoured to persuade the students to leave the institution. The students observed strike but Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya the founder of this University opposed and persuaded the students not to abandon their studies. There were also strikes and great stir in the famous educational

---

1. Gujratii (Bombay) 31st October, 1920.

2. Akhbar-e-Islam (Bombay) 28th October, 1920.

Institutions of Punjab e.g. the Islamia College and the Khalsa College. The question of national education aroused much sympathy in Gujrat and national Schools and Colleges began to spring up there. Teachers as well as students boycotted Government Institutions with great earnestness. Khilafat workers and other national minded people collected outside the School and College buildings to exhort teachers, students and their guardians to leave the Institutions and curses were heard at those who had not listened to them.

Is

Success and Failure of Non-Co-operation Movement:

That the movement of non-violent non-cooperation has made the best beginning we could have made in this direction goes without saying. We would, therefore, assert that in merely asserting India's moral spirit which revolts against the present system the movement of non-cooperation has eminently succeeded. But it has not stopped there. It has achieved some practical results worthy of note. The students unrest at Aligarh has shown itself to be genuine movement fruitful of good results. To Cynical critics we would point out

---

1. Praja Mitra and Parsi, (Bombay) 26th November, 1920.

the National Muslim University at Aligarh as a sign-post of the students movement in Lahore, Calcutta, Madras, United Provinces, Sind and elsewhere will leave some sign-posts though less marked and not worthy than the Aligarh National University. No spell of College education in state-controlled institutions as making for unqualified national good is broken. Though very few title holders have given up their titles the institution of giving titles stands discredited. Above all, the movement is succeeding wonderfully in freeing the national mind from the grip of the fear of Government, which is no longer regarded as a 'My bay' trustee. There is absolutely no doubt of the fact that the movement has already begun to operate and successfully.<sup>1</sup>

The principle of non-cooperation sprang into existence because Government killed cooperation by their own hands and the movement will in one form or another live till the national demands are satisfied.<sup>2</sup>

- 
1. New Times:- (Karachi) 5th November, 1920.
  2. Kosari:- (Poona) 9th November, 1920.

Another opportunity to lead India to Swaraj along the path of non-violence arose over the Khilafat question. It was Mahatma Gandhi's mandate that made the Khilafat a general political issue. Non-cooperation movement had gathered force but an examination of its practical aspects discloses some weak points which require consideration at this stage.

Its educative value had been great, it had reached a considerable portion of the masses and it has called forth immense sacrifice and courage. eil

Actual non-cooperation by way of the relinquishing of titles and honorary offices, the abandonment of educational institutions and the boycott of law courts has not been anything like universal.

The abstinence of the great majority of voters from the polling booths is an item of positive success. The practical value of which, however, is discounted by the fact that the councils are full.

The practical results of non-cooperation may be summed up as follows:-

"They have failed to persuade more than a fractional proportion of the title holders to surrender their titles,



or of lawyers to resign their practice. But on the other hand they have been successful in causing educational dislocation to a considerable degree and in preventing member of the left wing National party from giving a seat in the new councils.

Wherever Gandhiji has made his appearance, the Government aided educational institutions are boycotted. His hold upon the students mentality is great for they are a class to whom his idealism and frank appeal to other regarding emotions prove naturally attractive.<sup>1</sup>

A considerable portion of the intelligentsia of the country is, therefore, either not able to join the movement or consists of co-operators who are actively supporting the Government which is highly organized and physically unassailable.<sup>2</sup> In the beginning of November, 1920 Government found it desirable to make plain what exactly its policy was towards this movement: "They have instructed local Governments to take action against those persons only, who in furtherance of the movement have gone beyond the limits originally set by its organizers and have, by speech or writing, openly incited the

---

1. Modern Review; December, 1921.

2. Modern Review; December, 1921.

public to violence, or have attempted to tamper with the loyalty of the army or the police." Government further expressed their trust and belief that "the sanity of the classes and masses alike would reject non-cooperation as visionary and chimerical scheme, which if successful could only result in wide spread disorder, political chaos and ruin of all those who have any real stake in the country."<sup>1</sup>

The Mutafiq Fatwa, November, 1920:

In November, 1920 a meeting of Jamiat-Ul-Uloom i.e. the body of Muslim divines was held at Delhi to take a decision on the question for the redress of the Khilafat wrong. The decision of this meeting was published in the form of religious verdict which is famous as the 'Mutafiq Fatwa' or the agreed decree in the history of the Khilafat movement.

This Fatwa had the signature of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Maulana Mufti Mohammad Kifayat Ullah of Delhi, Maulvi Azad Sobhani of Kanpur, Maulvi Mohammad Daud of

---

1. Sitaramayya Pattabhi: The History of the Indian National Congress Vol.(i) p.204.

Ghazni, Maulana Abdül Bari of Lucknow, Maulana Sanaullah of Amritsar, Maulana Azizul Rehman-Mufti of Deoband and other celebrated Muslim divines. The following are some of the important points of this Fatwa:-

1. It is unlawful to be the members of legislature Councils.
  2. It is unlawful to do pleadership in Government Courts.
  3. It is unlawful to get education in Government Schools or Colleges and in those aided by the Government.
  4. It is unlawful to keep honorary magistracy, honorary ranks and the titles given by the government.
  5. All the Government services from which the Government receives help are forbidden (Haram) specially serving in the Army and Police is a serious sin as they are duty bound to shoot their brothers and God says in Holy Quran, Surah Mairaj, "whoever will intentionally slaughter any Muslim will be punished in hell for ever", and Holy Prophet has said, " whoever lifted weapon against Muslim would cease to be a Muslim."<sup>1</sup>
- 
1. Confidential Report on the Non-Co-operation and Khilafat movement by Deputy Director Intelligence Bureau, Government of India, pp.162-163.

Boycott of election to the Reformed Councils, Nov., 1920:

The Congress, the Khilafat Committee, the Muslim League and the Jamiat-Ul-Ulema had all decided in favour of complete boycott of the reformed councils. Mahatma Gandhi had already called upon the voters not to go to the polling stations on the day of election and to check others from doing so as it was wrong to enter the Councils in view of the fact that the Government had declined to do justice in the matter of Punjab wrongs and the British ministers had broken their pledges to the Muslims and ignored the deepest Muslim sentiments regarding the Khilafat.<sup>1</sup> The result was that important Hindus and Muslims throughout the country refrained from seeking elections to the councils and only insignificant and pro-government persons were elected to these bodies. A large majority of voters refrained from exercising their right of franchise. In the absence of the voters crowd, policemen in large numbers were seen near the polling booths.<sup>2</sup> After the elections were over, Muslims in various parts of the country organised meetings to condemn, curse those of their co-religionists who had got themselves elected as members of several legislative councils in disobedience to the commands of God and Prophet Mohammed and the decrees of religious leaders.<sup>3</sup>

1. Young India, (Ahmedabad) 7th July, 1920 and Kaiser-i-Hind, (Bombay Weekly) 14th Nov., 1921.
2. Gujarati, dated 21 November, 1920.
3. Mufed-e-Rozgar, 11th November, 1920.

The No-vote Campaign had been a remarkable success. Less successful was the boycott of courts through their prestige had been greatly damaged.<sup>1</sup> Numerous lawyers had left their profession throughout the country and thrown themselves heart and soul into the movement. An expected measure of response, however, was noticeable in the field of National Education. The fact was Mahatma Gandhi's appeal to the finer instincts of the youth of the country to devote themselves to its services, and to show the institutions which had been created and maintained to kill all manliness in them, was responded to with enthusiasm. Nor was the work confined to merely boycott. National Universities, National Colleges, and National Schools of all grades were started in different parts of the country.<sup>1</sup>

Non-Cooperation propaganda pursued vigorously in 1921.

After the Nagpur session of the Congress, the Muslim League and the Khilafat Conference, the non-cooperation programme was pressed forward with intense earnestness and zeal. The course of the non-cooperation campaign during the year 1921 was marked by three distinct stages in its

---

1. Sitaramayya Pattabhi: The History of the Indian National Congress Vol.1 p.211.

own evolution, and by several minor ones which resulted from the intense antagonism it met from the Government and its supporters. The three main stages were:-

- (1) The students movement throughout the length and breadth of the country during January and February which led to a wide spread students revolt and to the establishment of many national schools and colleges
- (2) The Congress Tilak-Swaraj fund collections which were made vigorously by the middle of the year and amounted by July 1st, 1921 to a Crore Rupees. (3) The Charkha and Khaddar movement during the later part of the year which had the advantage of being adventitiously stimulated by the maddeningly repressive policy of the Government in the winter of 1921<sup>1</sup>

In January, 1921 His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught, under commission from His Majesty the King, came to inaugurate the newly constituted legislative Councils in India. When the declaration about the Duke's visit was made, Mahatma Gandhi advised a complete boycott of all public function which were to be held in his honour as he was coming to sustain a corrupt system of

---

1. The Indian Annual Register, 1922 pp.144-45.

Government and to white wash an irresponsible bureaucracy and not to heal the wounds inflicted upon India but to mock at the Indians by flinging doceptive reforms at them.<sup>1</sup>

The Congress resolution completely shattered the British prestige to maintain which the arrival of the Duke of Connaught was principally meant. His Madras speech was quite lifeless and was full of dry and incipid political philosophy.<sup>2</sup>

The following comment sums up the existing nationalist feelings. .

When the whole of India was suffering with discontent on account of the Punjab and Khilafat wrongs and of the selfishness and inordinate evil-mindedness of the bureaucracy, the visit of the Duke on a peace mission to India to be achieved by mere sweet but hollow words was utterly futile.

The new Reforms had erected two parties viz; The moderates and the Nationalists. The former while condemning the policy of coercion and repression strongly believed that self-Government could be achieved by working the reforms and entering the councils.

The Nationalists had no faith in words and actions of the Government but maintained that they could not expect

- 
1. Young India, (Ahmedabad) 1st December, 1920.
  2. Prajapaksha 16th Jan., 1921, Udaya, 18th Jan., 1921.  
Maharashtra 19th, 1921, Nagpur Samachar 18th Jan., 1921  
Young patriot 17th Jan., 1921, Karmavir, 15th Jan., 1921  
Taj 18th Jan., 1921.

to get the repressive laws repealed by begging Government to do so. They regarded the Councils as mere farce and a trap. When the non-cooperation movement was first started in India, the head of the Bureaucracy viz. the Present Viceroy, had declared it to be a foolish movement and had expressed his conviction that it would either die out itself or the innate good sense of Indians would reject it. But the facts were now quite otherwise. The true believers in the non-cooperation doctrine had undergone sacrificing themselves and Government were arresting them declaring at the same time that they were dealing with the situation leniently.<sup>1</sup>

The Khilafat Movement in Different Provinces:-

In the first few months of the year 1921 a number of Provincial Khilafat Conferences and other Muslim Meetings were held in different parts of India, on account of which Muslim feelings rose to great heights. The two questions which were prominent on these platforms were the question of Swaraj and the Turkish question, more attention being concentrated on the latter. The first of these conferences was the Khilafat conference which was held in the end of February, 1921 at Lucknow under the

---

1. Taj: (Jubbulpore) 1st February, 1921.



Presidentship of Maulana Mohammad Ali. At this Conference Maulana Abdul Majid of Badaun proposed a resolution to secure Swaraj for India, Mahatma Gandhi, who was present also delivered a speech explaining the meaning of Swaraj and while dwelling on the position of various communities in India he said that he had joined the Khilafat Movement to help the Muslims, for, to him their success meant Swaraj. The Khilafat Committee in Sind, at a meeting held at Karachi the 21st of February, 1921 declared that no settlement would be acceptable to the Muslims if it was inconsistent with the Islamic law regarding the Khilafat and allied matters, including Jazirat-ul-Arab. The Khilafat agitation also touched upon other grounds, and at Ajmer, on the occasion of Urs (an annual gathering to celebrate the death anniversary of Sheikh Muin Uddin Chisti at his shrine) a Khilafat conference was held on the 13th and 14th of March, 1921. No less than seven resolutions were passed expressing strong resentment of Muslim sentiments about the Khilafat question and the unjust peace treaty and the Khilafat leaders hoped that the seed of discontent would be disseminated by the large number of pilgrims present from surrounding states. The conference reaffirmed non-cooperation and expressed confidence in the work of Mustafa Kama<sup>71</sup>: Pasha and expressing allegiance to the Sultan Khalifa of

Turkey. A resolution requesting the Amir of Afghanistan not to enter into a treaty with the British Government and to take into consideration the feelings of the people in India was also passed. The conference was attended among others by Maulanas Mohammad Ali, Abul Kalam Azad, Abdul Majid and Abdul Bari. In the same month (March 21) a number of Khilafat conferences were held in the United Provinces and in Bengal.

In the same month i.e. of March, 1921, Abul Kalam Azad wrote an article in the form of a Fatwa on non-cooperation and national education which dealt with the religious and political aspect of the Khilafat question. The circulation of this Fatwa had considerable influence on political movement in the country particularly in Sind, Punjab and Frontier Provinces.<sup>1</sup>

Maulana Mohammad Ali, during the course of a tour of the South, declared on 2nd April, 1921 at Madras that if the Amir of Afghanistan was to invade India, not with a view to its subjugation, but to attack those who wished to subjugate his people, who held the holy places of Islam, who wished to crush Islam and destroy Muslim faith and the Khilafat, then it would be the duty of Muslims not merely to refuse to assist the Government but to gird up their loins and fight the good fight for Islam.<sup>2</sup>

1. Confidential Report on the Non-cooperation and Khilafat Movement by Deputy Director Central Intelligence Bureau Home Department, Government of India pp 164-166.

2. India in 1921-22 Appendix XIII, p.302.

discussed, and the arguments proceeded on the line that Indian Muslims were not in position to under take Jihad, they should continue to work the non-cooperation programme. At the same time and place a Khilafat Conference # (the All India Khilafat Conference) was held under the Presidentship of Maulana Mohammad Ali in which the following resolutions were passed:-

- (1) "This meeting of the All India Khilafat Conference respectfully professes its most devout allegiance to the Khilafat-ul-Muslmin, Amirul Momnin Sultan Wahiduddin Mohammad successor of the Holy Prophet and assures His imperial Majesty that the Indian Muslims would spare no sacrifice in upholding the integrity and prestige of the Khilafat and in liberating the Muslim territorial especially Jazirat-ul-Arab from non-Muslim control. This meeting further expects that the Khilafat-ul-Muslmin will fully appreciate and value the meritorious effort of Ghazi Mustafa Kasal Pasha and his comrades in their noble struggle for the preservation of the Islamic Interest".
- (2) "This meeting views with appreciation and gratitude the valuable services of the devotees of religious and country who gave practical proof of their strength of faith in the path of truth and righteousness and endured with

fortitude and courage suffering and hardships inflicted on them by the repressive action of the authorities".

(3) "This conference emphatically declares that the demands of the Indian Muslims regarding the integrity of the Khilafat preservation of the sanctity of Jazirat-ul-Arab and the holy places of Islam, formulated in accordance with the commandments of Shar'iat, are still the same as stated here to before and that until those demands are entirely satisfied the Indian Muslims would not rest themselves nor would they permit the enemies of Islam and Khilafat to rest"

(4) "This conference directs the Central Khilafat Committee to send from time to time its representative to other Muslim countries, whenever feasible and necessary, with a view to establish and maintain fraternal relations with Muslims of other countries and to remove their sufferings and hardships and to promote other Islamic Interests".

(5) "This conference offers hearty congratulations to Ghazi Mustafa Kamal Pasha and the Government of Angora on their brilliant victories and heroic efforts for the preservation of the Islamic Empire and prays the Almighty that they may similarly succeed as early as possible in expelling the

allied forces from every corner of the Turkish territories. This meeting further emphatically declares that in the present circumstances the Holy Shariat forbids every Muslim serve or enlist himself in the British army or to raise recruits for it, that it is incumbent on all Muslim in general and all Ulema in particular to carry this religious commandment to every Muslim soldier in the British Indian army. This meeting further declares that in case the British Government directly or indirectly, secretly or openly, resume hostilities against the Government of Angora, the Indian Muslims will be compelled in cooperation with the Congress to resort to civil disobedience and at the next session of the congress at Ahmadabad to declare India's independence and the establishment of an Indian Republic".

(6) "This conference earnestly invites the attention of all Indian Muslims in general and Provincial Khilafat Committee in particular, to enrol immediately one crore of Khilafat members and collect 40 lakhs of Rupees through sale of Khilafat receipts for the aid of sufferers from Smyrna and Muhajirin and other national requirements and thereby to give practical proof of their Islamic zeal and brotherhood".

(7) "This conference directs all Khilafat Committees to take effective steps in their jurisdiction for the prevention of the use of liquor and cooperation with the Congress Committees and congratulates all workers, volunteers of those places where the use of liquor is almost stopped".

(8) "This Conference earnestly requests all Indians in general and Muslims in particular, to make it incumbent upon them selves to use hand-spun and handwoven cloth exclusively and to reserve the use of Indian machine - made cloth for their poor brothers and to offer all stock of foreign cloth for Muslim sufferers of Smyrna. This meeting further expects that people will manifest the same zeal and energy in this direction as was shown by them in collections for Swaraj fund. It also invites Indian sisters to revive the old art of spinning thereby to remove poverty from India.<sup>1</sup>

Moplah rebellion:-

The Moplahs were the descendants of the Arabs who had settled in Kerala over a thousand years ago. Most of them were poor and ignorant and were occupied in agriculture or petty trade. They were very backward and greatly under

---

1. Indian Annual Register 1921 pp.236-240.

the influence of their Qazis and Maulvis known as Thengals. From February 1921, the non-cooperation propaganda began to spread in Kerala. On February 16 four leaders-two Hindus and two Muslims- were arrested. Excitement began to grow, conferences were held and more persons were imprisoned. The Khilafatist meetings, where the wrongs of Islam were described, exacerbated religious feelings. The authorities attempted to suppress the movement which seemed to threaten law and order. The Moplahs then rebelled and started a guerrilla war with swords and spears against guns and rifles. The inflamed Moplahs rose against the administration as well as their Hindu landlords who exploited them and supporters of the Government. For some time the administration was paralysed. The Government called in troops to suppress the rising and measures of extreme severity were taken against the rebels. In the middle of October, martial law was imposed and by the end of the year peace was restored<sup>1</sup>.

A great controversy had raged about the causes of the rising Moplahs. Even officials of Government took opposite views regarding the inciting causes. Innes, Acting collector of Malabar, on the one hand, held that the economic conditions

---

1. 1921 Movement: Reminiscences, pp 28,29.

were responsible for the troubles which disturbed Malabar from time to time. On the other hand, Evans, his superior, controverted this thesis and held that the Moplah discontent could not be traced to economic factors like the land tenure system, but was the result of political incitement.<sup>1</sup>

The Madras Government, while agreeing with Evans, admitted, "it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that to some extent at least the phenomena which appeared in the North during the last century- the growth of population, the rise in price, the substitution of competition for custom, the consequent friction between landlords and tenants and its sequels, litigations, evictions, exactions must have manifested themselves in Malabar"<sup>2</sup>

In the existing economic conditions, there was ample predisposition to disturbance. The feelings stirred by the India wide agitation for Khilafat and Swaraj proved an aggravating factor, and then the police excesses -the prohibition of entry into Malabar in case

---

1. 1921 Movement: Reminiscences, p.29.

2. Ibid



of persons like Rajagopal Achari and Yaqub Hasan, the arrests on a large scale of leaders, and the attempt to suppress the non-violent non-cooperation movement-proved the last straw. The religious passions were excited and fanaticism eventuated in unspeakable horrors.<sup>1</sup>

The measures for the suppression of the rising were as extremely savage: ~~xxxxxx deeds of the Moplahs.~~ Troops from Nepal, Garhwal and Burma were concentrated upon the land. Gurkhas, Garhwalis, Kachins, were utter strangers to the people and therefore wholly devoid of any sympathy towards the rebels. The atrocities committed by the Moplahs were answered by ruthless <sup>and severe</sup> punishment under martial law. The worst incident of this revolting affair was the packing of nearly 150 Moplahs in iron wagons of a goods train which slowly travelled under the scorching rays of the mid-summer sun from Calicut to Madras, and when the wagon was opened at way side station it was found that the large majority had died of suffocation and the living were in a precarious condition.<sup>2</sup>

---

1. 1921 Movement: Reminiscences, p.29.

2. 1921 Movement: Reminiscences, pp.29,30.

The rebellion lasted for over six months. It is estimated that as a result of the rebellion about ten thousand people had lost their lives. Many innocent people were convicted by the Military court. Among them was M.P. Narayan Menon, who tried his best to restrain the rebels but was charged with the offence of treason, and sentenced to fourteen years' rigorous imprisonment.<sup>1</sup>

The All India Congress Committee met at Delhi on 5th of November, 1921 to take stock of the situation and to consider future action. The main feature of this session was the restlessness displayed by a large proportion of the delegates against Gandhiji's hesitation of declaring mass civil disobedience immediately. Ultimately the A.I.C.C. authorised every provincial committee on its own responsibility to start civil disobedience including non-payment of taxes in the matter considered most suitable by its subject to the following conditions. Every individual civil resister must have fulfilled the part of the non-cooperation programme applicable to him; should know spinning, must have

---

1. 1921 Movement: Reminiscences, p.161.

discarded foreign cloth, taken to Khaddar, must be a believer in Hindu-Muslim Unity, believer in non-violence as absolutely essential for the redress of the Khilafat and Punjab wrongs and the attainment of Swaraj, and if a Hindu, must be his personal conduct show that he regarded untouchability as a blot upon nationalism. In regard to mass civil disobedience a district or Tehsil should be treated as a unit and there in a majority of the population must have adopted full swadeshi and must be clothed out of hand-spun and hand woven cloth in that area and must believe in and practice all other items of non-cooperation. No one should expect support out of public funds. It was open to the working committee of the Congress to waive any condition on the application of the Provincial Congress Committee.<sup>1</sup> The A.I.C.C. thus while permitting civil disobedience, in effect almost forbade it by the strictness and extent of the limitation it imposed.

---

1. Nehru, J.L. The Indian National Congress 1920 to 1923 A Collection of the resolutions of the Congress from Sept. 1920 to Dec.1923 pp.72-74.

Boycott of the visit of the Prince of Wales:

The Prince of Wales, the heir to the British throne, who ~~ascended after the death of George V as Edward VIII in 1936~~ landed in Bombay on November 17th, 1921 to see the country and to understand things for himself. He was received by the Viceroy, the Governor of Bombay and the ruling chiefs and Princes of India. The Indian National Congress and the Central Khilafat Committee of India had already passed resolutions advising the country men to boycott in Prince's visit. Volunteers for the purpose had also been enrolled in every province. Mahatma Gandhi had expressed the view that the Prince had been brought to India in order to strengthen the hold of the civil service which had brought India into a state of abject pauperism and political serfdom.<sup>1</sup> He asked the people to (1) organize complete boycott of all functions in the prince's honour.

- (2) Refuse to illuminate or to send children to see organised illuminations.
- (3) Religiously refrain from attending charities, fetes or fire works organised for the purpose.
- (4) Publish leaflets, about the boycott of the Prince's/<sup>visit</sup> by the million and distribute <sup>them</sup>
- (5) See that every city bore the appearance of a deserted city on the day the Prince visited it<sup>2</sup>

---

1. Indian Annual Register 1922, p.337.  
2. Indian Annual Register 1922, pp. 307-306.

The day the Prince arrived, a huge public meeting was arranged in Bombay at which Gandhiji urged the people to boycott all official functions in connection with the royal visit. A huge bonfire of a pile of foreign cloth was also made. The City observed complete Hartal. But the boycott demonstrations led to a serious riot in Bombay which continued for full five days. Gandhiji immediately published a statement repenting over the mob-fury and holding himself responsible for the disaster.<sup>1</sup> The Hartal which was observed at Calcutta on the day of the Prince's visit to that City, in striking contrast to the mob outrage of Bombay, was perfectly peaceful though it was more extensive and significant. Calcutta looked like a deserted city, all shops, bazars and great business markets being closed. Not alone in Calcutta-all over India at all the places which the prince visited such as Patna, Allahabad and Madras, there was a complete Hartal and complete cessation of all activities and business. The people of India thus did not acquiesce in a welcome which was solely organised by the bureaucracy to boost up its morale, which was gradually declining on account of the great awakening engendered in the country by the Khilafat Movement and its active programme of non-cooperation.

---

1. Speeches and Writings of M.K.Gandhi, pp.617-636.

very humiliated and demoralised  
The Government felt ~~insulted~~/at the successful  
boycott of the Prince of Wales by the people of India.  
It, therefore, took recourse to the policy of repression.  
The Anglo-Indian and European communities living in ~~India~~  
India raised an alarm and their newspapers poured  
forth a Venom of abuse against the non-cooperators and  
their leaders in flaring headlines. An exhibition of  
racial hatred, similar to the one which prevailed in  
India in the days of General Dwyer, was made by them. They  
demanded "immediate action against the people who were  
bringing Government into disrepute" alleging that the  
inactivity of the Government had resulted in "not only the  
educated classes but also the masses gaining a contempt  
for authority".<sup>1</sup> In other words they urged the Government  
to follow a vigorous policy of repression. The response  
from the Government came very quickly. The first spark  
of repression was let off from the Government House  
Calcutta. On November 19th, 1921, the Government of Bengal,  
under the criminal law Amendment Act of 1908, declared the  
Congress and Khilafat Volunteer organisations unlawful,  
alleging that "these volunteers were carrying on a persistent  
campaign of intimidation and molestation in Calcutta".<sup>2</sup>

- 
1. Resolution passed by the European Association of Calcutta, quoted in Indian Annual Register, 1922, p.310.
  2. Communique of the Government of Bengal, dated Nov.19th 1921 quoted in the Indian Annual Register 1922, p.311.

The Calcutta police also raided the Khilafat and Congress offices and all papers, documents, account books etc were taken away obviously with the intention of paralysing the movement/ <sup>and all</sup> public assemblies and processions were also banned in Calcutta as well as in other town of Bengal. The other provincial Governments were not slow to act. In Delhi, Punjab, U.P. Assam, Bihar and Orissa the volunteer associations were declared unlawful and many districts were declared to be proclaimed areas under the seditious Meetings Act. Arrests, gagging orders, house searches, police raids, firing and other methods of torture and tyranny used by a strong police-rule became the order of the day. The challenge thrown by the Government was taken up by the people by its open defiance.

Not only were volunteers enlisted with greater zeal but their names were published in newspapers from day to day. The Government retribution was also not slow to come. Barring Mahatma Gandhi and Hakim Ajmal Khan, almost all the top ranking Congress and Khilafat leaders including lala Lajpat Rai, Mr. C.R. Das, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Mr. Subbash Chandra Bose and Pandit Moti Lal Nehru had been arrested and sentenced to various terms of

imprisonment. The Ali Brothers and Maulana Husain Ahmad Madni and Dr. Kitchlew had been arrested earlier. About 30,000 people were behind prison bars upto January 1922. There were protests against Government repression all over the country. Even the great Indian poet Rabinādra Nath Tagore had to warn the Government of the "dumb-fury of the weak and downtrodden Indians if it did not regain its balance".<sup>1</sup>

The moderates, who were on the side of the Government in this movement, also disapproved of the wholesale and indiscriminate arrests and imprisonments that were taking place in the name of law and order. Many of them gave up their Council seats and many gave up their titles and some openly and some unobtrusively became non-cooperators.<sup>2</sup> Thus the effect of acts of repression and coercion was the strengthening of the very movement which the Government wanted to crush.

- 
1. Indian Annual Register 1922 p.320(a).
  2. Indian Annual Register 1922, p.320(b).



### Civil Disobedience Movement

The annual session of the Indian National Congress was held in Ahmadabad from 24th to 27th Dec., 1921 under the acting President of Hakim Ajmal Khan at a time when very many of its top leaders were behind the bars. The Congress adopted Mahatma Gandhi's resolutions calling for "aggressive civil disobedience to all Government laws and constitution, for non-violence, for the continuance of public meetings throughout India despite the Government prohibition and for all Indians to offer themselves peacefully for arrest by joining the volunteer Corps". It made Gandhiji its "executive authority" with a condition that he should agree to no change in the national creed nor make peace with the Government without the consent of the Congress. The Congress appealed to the people for inter-communal unity and expressed its firm conviction that the Moplah disturbance was not due to the non-cooperation or the Khilafat Movement but on account of the provocation from the side of the Government and a direct outcome of repression. It also congratulated Ghazi Mustafa Kamal Pasha and the Turks upon their successes and assured the Turkish nation of

India's sympathy and support in its struggle to retain its status and independence.<sup>1</sup>

The annual session of the All India Khilafat Conference was held at Ahmedabad under the presidency of Hakim Ajmal Khan in December 1921. At this conference the most important resolutions passed were the following:-

(1) As the British Government is not prepared to do justice over the Khilafat and Jazirat-ul-Arab questions inspite of all efforts of Indians that are humanly possible, but on the other hand is carrying on its intrigues in order to destroy the prestige of the Khilafat and whereas the repression under cover of so called law and justice is growing more day by day and the peaceful volunteer corps have been declared unlawful in order to stop the Khilafat Movement by unlawful means, and where as the best representatives of the nation and even the respected Ulama are being imprisoned and public and private meetings are forcibly stopped and whereas the question of religious freedom has no respect in the eyes of the Government as is apparent from the

---

1. Nehru, J.L: The Indian National Congress 1920 to 1923  
A Collection of the resolutions of the  
Congress from Sept. 1920 to 1923, pp.150-57.

Karachi resolution and practical experience shows that the method of demanding and safeguarding rights adopted by the Khilafat Committee is right and it is necessary to go further under the present circumstances. This conference, therefore calls upon all the Muslims of and above age of 18 to join the Khilafat volunteer corps to carry on the proposed duties pertaining to religion and country with the National volunteer corps and prepare themselves for going to Jail and to suffer other punishment.

(2) For the success of the Khilafat cause and to obtain Swaraj and justice for the Punjab the Central Khilafat Committee will issue instructions from time to time regarding civil disobedience. Instructions to hold public and private meetings in contravention of orders prohibiting them should be issued to begin civil disobedience simultaneously if the provincial or the central Khilafat committees are satisfied that there will be no likelihood of breach of Peace. Resolutions were also passed urging Muslims to collect funds for Angora, congratulating the Ali Brothers on their imprisonment and Kamal Pasha on his successes, expressing allegiance

to the Khalifa. In the speeches made at this conference Muslims were called upon to prepare to resort to civil disobedience in conjunction with the congress. The subjects committee of the Khilafat conference passed a resolution declaring as its goal independence and the destruction of British imperialism, but it was ruled out of order by the President on the ground that according to the constitution of the Khilafat Committee no motion which contemplated a change in their creed could be taken as adopted unless it was voted for in the subjects Committee by a majority of two third.<sup>1</sup>

Non-cooperation with Government as a political force made rapid progress. Prosecutions in the cases of incitements to violence were instituted by Government with greater speed. The "repressive" laws and press acts, were referred to a non-official committee of the legislature. The movement manifested itself in various forms-strikes, campaign against the use of foreign cloth, an increase of racial feeling, a more virulent Khilafat agitation, attempts to seduce the police and the army from their allegiance, and various out-breaks of mob violence at <sup>various places.</sup> Mohammad Ali and Shaukat Ali were prosecuted and convicted.

---

1. Indian Annual Register, 1922 Appendices, pp 127-134.

for advocating at the Khilafat Conference held in July in Karachi, a religious injunction to Muslims against service in army. Many disturbances, with serious loss of life, took place at various places in July. The Moplah rebellion and the regrettable incidents connected with the reception of the Prince of Wales on November, 17 at Bombay were followed by an increasing disregard for authority and necessitated drastic measures by Government, which authorised the application of seditious meeting Act. In reply to a demand for a Round Table Conference, put forward by the "Moderates" Lord Reading insisted on the necessity of the discontinuance of the unlawful activities of the non-cooperation party. A resolution about the Round Table Conference moved <sup>in</sup> subjects at Ahmedabad committee/was rejected. Gandhiji announced that he reserved the right to continue during a conference preparations for civil disobedience, etc., whilst putting forward conditions which the Government were asked to accept.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. Annual Register 1921 p.275.

CHAPTER - IV:

COLLAPSE OF THE KHILAFAT MOVEMENT

Government of India's despatch and its effect upon  
the Khilafat Movement, March, 1922.

The Khilafat Movement received another jolt in March 1922, when the Government of India stole the thunder of the India Khilafatists by sending a despatch to the Home Government on the Khalifat question. By that time the Greek position had deteriorated to such a point that the Greek Foreign Minister had to go to London to impress upon British Statesmen the necessity of giving further assistance to his country in the form of war material and financial aid to balance the military reverses. Lord Curzon at this point decided on a policy of securing agreement of the belligerents to an armistice as a prelude to the evacuation of Anatolia by the Greek forces<sup>1</sup>.

In India the Khilafatists leaders carried on this propaganda that British Government were extending financial help to Greece and the Government of India became seriously concerned over this development. Pressed by Indian Muslim opinion, the Viceroy forwarded a strongly worded message to Mr. Montagu, the then Secretary of State for India, which called for a total revision of the Treaty of Sevres.

---

1. Ronald Shay: life of Lord Curzon, Vol.III, p.283.

In particular the Government of India urged three points which they themselves regarded as essential. First, evacuation of Constantinople; secondly the recognition of Sultan's Suzerainty over the Holy places of Islam<sup>and</sup>/thirdly restoration of Ottoman Thrace, including the Muslim city of Adrianople and the unreserved restoration of Smyrna. The Government of India expressed their trust that his Majesty's Government would give<sup>these</sup>/matters all possible weight as their solution would very much ease the Indian situation.

Lord Reading, in asking for the publication of this despatch, spoke of his duty to warn the nation of the immense dangers inherent in failing to placate reasonable and friendly Muslim opinion. He also wrote that the Government and Ministers of every province in British India fully shared his views.<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Montagu authorised the publication of this document without obtaining the cabinet's sanction. Strong exception was taken when the Near Eastern conference at Paris was going to take place where he was to go with a formula to restrict Turkey to Asia Minor.

---

1. For full text of the Viceroy's message, please see London Times, March 9, 1922.



Mr. Montagu had to resign for the error of judgement in publishing such an important despatch. The intervention of the Government of India on behalf of the Muslims of India which caused the resignation of the Secretary of state, however, proved most significant from the stand point of the Khilafat Movement and the sacrifice of this high office by Mr. Montagu had marked effect on the Khilafat movement. Indian Muslims were pleased that the Government of India had sent despatch on behalf of Indian Muslims to England, which contained fair and honourable terms for the settlement of the Khilafat question. They hailed Montagu as a sincere friend of Islam and expressed their thanks to him for appreciating the keenness of the Muslim feeling on the subject.<sup>1</sup> But resented that he had been sacked on account of the sympathy for his Muslim cause.

In a bid to sustain the movement and to keep up the pressure during the Near Eastern Conference which was to assemble at Paris for the purpose of revision of the Turkish peace terms as a result of the victories of Kamal Pasha over the Greeks, Hakim Ajmal Khan and

---

1. For Muslim Reaction Sind observer, (Karachi) 8th March, 1922; Bombay Chronicle, 11th March, 1922, Political Bhowmyo (Ahmedabad) 10th March, 1922 and Khilafat-e-USmaniyah, 17th March, 1922.

Dr. Ansari published on the 20th March, 1922 a manifesto mentioning the demands of the Indian Muslims which fell under the following two heads; (1) The Turkish portion of the ottoman Empire, comprising Thrace with Adrianople, constantinople and the whole of Anatolia including Smyrna, should be restored to Turkey, with full sovereign rights without any financial, economic, military or naval control of any foreign power and without the capitulations.

(2) The Arabic speaking poritions of the ottoman Empire comprising palestine, Syria, Mesopotamia and Hedjaz, should be given full independence. These should not be under the control of any non-Muslim power in any way. But the Suzerainty of the Sultan of Turkey should be maintained over the Holy places of Islam.

The manifesto stated that these demands represented the irreducible minimum, based on the religious commandments of Islam and made it clear that the Muslims would go on with their efforts unabated until they had achieved them.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. The Bombay Chronicle, dated 20th March, 1922.

When the Near Eastern Conference was taking place, the Khilafat leaders confidently predicted its ignominious failure because of lack of good faith among the Allies, who always spoke in terms of guarantees, of military force, of industrial concessions and of monetary concessions.<sup>1</sup>

When the decisions arrived at the conference were published, Muslim leaders of all shades of opinion and sects denounced them as inadequate as they failed to satisfy either the Turkish patriots of Angora or the Muslims of India and did not substantially mitigate the harshness of the terms of the Treaty of Sevres. They thought that Muslims had been deceived and all promises made to them had been broken.<sup>2</sup> The Muslim leaders contended that the demilitarization of the straits zone, as proposed and decided upon by the conference, would threaten the national security of Turkey leaving her open to attack by any future enemy and suggested ratification of the capitulations imposed by the Sevres Treaty upon Turkey would cripple and enslave Turkey

---

1. The Bombay Chronicle, March 28, 1922.

2. The Gujراتi, (Bombay), April 2, 1922.

financially and would conflict with the conception of Turkey as an independent state. They particularly condemned the gift of Gallipoli and Thrace including Adrianople to Greece, which were predominantly Muslim in population and denounced the non-restoration of the legal right of Khalifa over the Holy places and the domination and control of non-Muslim over the Jazirat-ul-Arab namely Syria, Iraq, Mesopotamia Palestine and Arabia.<sup>1</sup>

The central Khilafat Committee also issued a comprehensive statement on the decision of Near Eastern Conference protesting against the various clauses of the proposals as being at direct variance with Muslim religious aspirations, with the British premier's pledge to Indian Muslims and with the promises made by the Allies during the War.<sup>2</sup>

---

1. The Hindu, March 31, 1922.

2. The Bombay Chronicle April 13, 1922.

Victory of the Turks over Greece-

In June 1922 Greece resumed hostilities against Turkey in a last desperate bid to salvage victory from a situation which was becoming untenable.

The Greeks bombarded Samsun despite an Allied Naval blockade and Indian Muslims condemned the failure of the Allies to prevent this. At the end of July, when Greek leaders realised that there was little hope of ending the Anatolian venture, 40,000 Greek troops were transferred from Anatolia to Eastern Thrace and the Greek demanded the right to enter constantinople.

✓ In the beginning of August Lloyd George in the course of a speech said that Greece should be allowed to seek a solution at constantinople rather than Anatolia if Turkey does not accept satisfactory armistice terms. The leading Muslim Daily the Khilafat organ of central Khilafat committee of India remarked; " Not only has Mr. Lloyd George vomitted out poison towards the Turks and therefore towards the Muslims, but it appears quite clear from the speech that there is no wonder if he gives constantinople to Greek devils to annihilate Islam. England should be informed that if she wants peace

in the East and the friendship of the Muslims she should at once change her policy towards Greece!<sup>1</sup>

Indian Muslims opinion was conveyed to the British cabinet by the central Khilafat committee in the following terms:-

/"It is greatly to be desired that the restoration of constantinople and Thrace to Turkish rule should be accomplished immediately. Indians believe that the British Government still intends to break its pledged word to India and defraud Turks. Religious movements for emigration has begun already. If constantinople, Thrace and the so called Neutral Zone are not atonce restored to Turkey and British troops not withdrawn immediately. If restoration is delayed, Hijrat will begin. At least one million Indian Muslims are preparing now to emigrate to help their Turkish brethren!<sup>2</sup> At the end of August the Turks launched a surprise counter offensive over whelmed the Greek forces in Anatolia and converted a Greek retreat into a rout.

---

1. Daily Khilafat,(Bombay) August 18, 1922.

2. Indian Annual Register,(Calcutta) 1923 p.57-58.

Turkish Nationalist force over ran all the territories that the Greeks had taken two years to conquer and began a march on constantinople thus raising a serious problem for the Allies, namely the prevention of a violation of the Armistice terms.'

Indian Muslim rejoice over Turkish Victories:-

The news of Kamal Pasha's convincing victory upon the Greeks thrilled Muslim hearts and revived enthusiasm for the Khilafat cause. Huge Processions Unprecedented in magnitude and enthusiasm were taken out by Muslims and numerous meetings were held throughout the country at which Mr. Lloyd George and lord curzon were condemned for pursuing anti-Turkish policies, joy was expressed over the splendid victories of the Turks and prayers were held for the complete destruction of the enemies of Islam!<sup>1</sup>

Demands for the restoration of all the territory taken away forcibly by the Allies from Turkey and for the payment of damages to the Turkey and by the Greeks for the injury they had done by commencing the war were vehemently put forth by Muslim leaders and the press<sup>2</sup>

---

1. Daily Khilafat, (Bombay) Sept. 18, 1922. and New Times Sept. 18, 1922.
2. The Bombay Samachar, Sept. 12, 1922.

✓While the Indian Muslims were still congratulating the Turks for their victory over Greece, news came to this country that Kamal Pasha and his modernist associates of Angora had decided to diminish the authority of the Khalifa by depriving him of his temporal powers. The reason for this was that Turkish Nationalists were determined to overthrow the old Turkey and build a new Democratic secular state in its place. As the Khilafat, in their opinion, was medieval and a harmful institution and the sultan-khalifa's temporal powers were the greatest hurdle in their way, they decided to do away with the temporal powers of the Khalifa. Besides, the Sultan of Turkey had been the Centre of British intrigues for the last four years. Their action was, however, precipitated by the Allied decision to invite both the Governments that of Angora as well as Constantinople to Lausanne conference. Obviously by doing so the Allied powers wanted to see Turkey broken up by internal dissensions and feuds. On November 1, 1922 the Turkish National Assembly, therefore, took the firm and quick action, of abolishing the Sultanate and converted Turkey into a Democratic Republic, thereby divesting the Khalifa of all temporal authority.



Sultan Waheed Uddin refused to accept the decision of the National Assembly and, therefore, he was deposed and Abdul Majid Kham<sup>11</sup> was elected Khalifa in his place. Sultan Waheed Uddin had already fled from Turkey and taken shelter in a British warship. When the news of these unexpected happenings reached India, the Muslims first did not believe these news and considered that these were fabrications of the British to make the Turks unpopular among Indian Muslims. But when truth became known, the Indian Muslims became intensely grieved over this development and they resented the Khalifa's deprivation of temporal powers which were a pre-requisite of the institution of Khilafat. Since the maintenance of the temporal powers of the Khalifa was one of the main objects of the Khilafat agitation, this action by none others but the Turks, whom Indian Muslims considered as the defenders of Islam and the Khilafat, completely took the wind out of the sails of the agitation. The Indian Khilafat leaders, however, faced awkward situation rather calmly. Instead of condemning Kamal Pasha, they first justified his action on the ground that whatever he had done was in the best interest of Islam<sup>1</sup> and said that Kamal Pasha had

---

1. The Wafadar (Navasari), 10th November, 1922.

reverted to old method of electing the Khalifa, which was in full accord with the Shariat.<sup>1</sup> The central Khilafat committee of India in a resolution passed in its meeting held at Calcutta on November 21, 1922 condemned Sultan Waheed Uddin for his anti-Islamic activities and for having all along proved an impediment in the way of Angora National Assembly and viewed with alarm the design of the British Government in connection with the question of Khilafat and its attempts to create discord in the Muslim world by affording protection to the deposed Sultan. The Committee also impressed upon the Muslims of other countries,<sup>to</sup> beware of the activities of the British Government and abstain from doing anything which may prove detrimental to Islamic unanimity of thought and action and which may afford enemies of Islam a chance to create hostile atmosphere against the National Assembly of Angora by professing sympathy for Islam.<sup>2</sup>

---

1. Alwahid, (Karachi) 12th November, 1922. .

2. Indian Annual Register, 1923 Vol. 11 p.63.

Meanwhile some doubts against the integrity of even the prominent leaders of the Khilafat Movement including the Ali Brothers, Hakim Ajmal Khan, Dr. Ansari, Mr. Mazharul Haq and Mr. Chotani were expressed and publication of account of the funds administered by them was demanded by certain groups.<sup>1</sup> At the end of 1922 it came to light that Seth Chotani had invested Khilafat money in his own business to the extent of about 17 lacs of Rupees and as a result of huge losses suffered by him there was no money left in the Khilafat funds.

As a result of the nasty propaganda a section of Muslim public opinion grew against the Khilafat leaders who now became through discredited and this made the financial position of the Khilafat organization very weak. Dr. Syed Mahmood who was the General Secretary of the All India Khilafat Committee vehemently refuted the allegations of embezzlement and misappropriation of Khilafat funds and the "Statesman" which had published stories about misappropriation of these funds had to offer apology<sup>2</sup> for making this unfounded allegation.

- 
1. Aligarh Gazette, 23rd June, 1921.
  2. Dr. Syed Mahmood's article "Looking back" in 1921 Movement, p. 147.

The Lausanne Conference:-

The strength of the Khilafat Movement in India had been lost by the end of 1922 when the Turkish Nationalists emerged victorious from the Anatolian war. It had, nevertheless, some effect on the negotiations at Lausanne extending from November, 1922 to July 1923. When the peace conference began, Nationalist Turkey was in possession of practically all the Territory claimed by her as Turkish forces had driven the Greeks from Anatolia and had overrun Eastern Thrace. Turkey's main problems were these of obtaining legalization of reconquests, ending the capitulations and other burdens which had been placed upon her by the Treaty of Sevres and solving the problem of minorities within her territory. As a result of the growth of Nationalism in Turkey the Kemalists were dissatisfied with the older concept of the Ottoman Empire which included among its subjects other nations and nationalities. They were fired with a desire to obtain a more homogeneous population by getting rid of the Greek minority which had betrayed Turkish Nationalist interest by co-operating with the enemy. The Conference met at Lausanne on the 20th November, 1922. The Government of India maintained a

constant vigil throughout the Lausanne conference as she had done on the previous stages of the Near Eastern settlement. Lord Reading apprehended that Allied-Turkish hostilities might break out again if the conference failed and this would be the signal for a fiercer explosion of Muslim feeling in India than any that had so far taken place."<sup>1</sup> He followed the news from lausanne so anxiously, supplying information about the development of opinion in India that "it is indeed scarcely an exaggeration to say that lord Reading played as important part in shaping British policy towards Turkey as if he had been sitting at the actual conference table at lausanne."<sup>2</sup>

The Allies presented peace terms to the Angora Government at the end of January, 1923. As these terms were not satisfactory to the Turks, they refused to accept them, with the result that there was a deadlock. The actual rock on which the split took place was the question of economic concessions in which France and Italy were primarily interested and so far as Britain was concerned she wanted Mosul on account of its rich oil deposits and its importance for British Control of the routes to India.

---

1. ~~Marquess of Reading (Ibid.)~~ First Marquess Reading p.232.  
2. Ibid.

The Conference at Lausanne accordingly broke up and the Turkish delegates took back to Angora the draft peace terms. A series of counter proposals were presented by Angora to the Allies early in April 1923 and on the 23rd of that month negotiations were renewed at Lausanne. One day news came of peace, next day of war during the succeeding three months. At one stage capitulations became a great hurdle to cross and at the other the question of ottoman debt came near to causing a deadlock. But the firm attitude of Angora and the Allied willingness to compromise enabled all difficulties to be surmounted. On July 24, 1923 peace was finally signed, and the Angora Government having ratified the Treaty on August 23, 1923, all Allied troops left Turkey within the next six weeks.

The effect the prolonged lausanne negotiations had on India was remarkable. For full nine months the Indian Muslims and their press talked of nothing else except of Angora and lausanne.<sup>1</sup>

In the Khilafat Conference and the Jamiat-ul-Ulema session held at Gaya in December 1922, the main theme was

---

1. Major General Sir Patrick Hehir: The Near Eastern Crisis: Nineteenth Century, November, 1922.

the in Turkish peace Treaty. The telegram from lausanne created much excitement at Gaya and the Khilafat leaders met in a conference in which it was declared that the whole of India would stand by Turkey. The British Government was warned of the consequences of precipitating in Indian war. The Muslims declared they would stand by the Turks to the last Muslim living and would disobey all laws which stood in the path of their religion. On Jan. 1, 1923 at its final sitting, the Khilafat conference warned the Government that in the event of war with Turkey, due to unjust attitude of Allies, particularly of Britain, the Muslims of India would immediately launch civil disobedience with a programme which would include spreading their propaganda among the police and army, the stoppage of fresh recruitment, refusal to subscribe to war loans, recruitment to the Angora legion, picketing of foreign cloth and liquor shops and preventing the export of food grains. The Conference did not stop with this. It decided to raise ten lakhs of Rupees and 50,000 volunteers within the next three month, when the committee would advise as to the launching of civil disobedience. The Angora legion was

to be at once started.' A resolution was also passed declaring that India's struggle for liberty would benefit by her making common cause with other Asiatic countries.<sup>1</sup>

But neither the occasion for launching civil Disobedience arose nor the need for starting Angora legion arose as due to the firmness of the Kemalists and softening down of the Allies, peace was concluded on 24th July, 1923, 23t as we have seen above. The occasion of the conclusion of peace was made into a huge Hindu-Muslim demonstration of rejoicings at the successful emergence of Turkey as an independent power after the war. A joint manifesto signed by about 150 Hindu and Muslim leaders representing different communities and all Provinces and presidencies was issued in which pence between Turkey and the Allies was called a complete triumph for the Turkish arms and a vindication by the Turks of their national honour and acquisition by them of a status among the great powers of Europe. The manifesto went on to say that though the Turks had achieved all their national aims, but the integrity of the Khilafat still remained to be restored

---

1. Indian Annual Register: 1923 Vol.1, pp. 922-924.



according to the requirements of Islam. It advised joint celebrations of Turkish peace by all the communities on Iduzzuha day.<sup>1</sup> The Central Khilafat Committee issued a *m* statement in which it declared that the successful termination of the Lausanne conference had secured only half of Muslim demands and that freedom of Jazirat-ul-Arab had yet to be secured, which was the Crux of the Khilafat question. ~~The Central Khilafat~~ Committee also appealed to both Hindus and Muslims to celebrate peace on a grand scale on ensuing Iduzzuha.<sup>2</sup>

Communal riots break down:-

Relations between the Hindus and Muslims became somewhat strained in August, 1921 on account of Moplah disorders in Calicut and other places of Malabar. Since then the relations between the two communities went on becoming worse day by day, inspite of the best efforts made by their leaders to improve them. The suspension of Civil Disobedience and the resumption of Cow-sacrifice at various places and the Multan and Fugli Communal riots widened the gulf between the two communities.

---

1. Indian Annual Register, 1923, Vol.11, pp.65-66.
2. Indian Annual Register, 1923, Vol.11, p. 67.

The Moplah outrages also affected adversely the Hindu Muslim relation. Some Muslim communalists either denied the atrocities committed on Hindus by Moplahs or minimised them and tried to shift the blame. Moreover, the Moplahs were praised for their religious zeal and bravery. The Hindu communalists were horrified. The exaggerated tales which reached the North inflamed feelings. The cry of Hinduism in danger was raised and movements of Shuddhi (reconversion) and Sangathan planned<sup>1</sup> by Swami Shardhanand who had been released under mysterious circumstances. Now with the satisfactory solution of the Turkish question and the slackening of the non-cooperation campaign, there remained no common object before the Hindu and the Muslim masses, with the result that their old communal differences were again revived and these took a very serious turn. The structure so painfully erected by Mahatma Gandhi crumbled hopelessly as soon as bond of common opposition to the British Government disappeared. Usually these riots occurred either on the cow sacrifice on the occasion of Idulazha, Tazia procession during Moharram and music played by the Hindu religious procession at the time of prayers before the mosque. Through out 1923 the tension between the Hindus

---

1. 1921 Movement: Reminiscences; p.30.

and Muslims in various parts of India increased to a lamentable extent. In February, March, April there were open riots of serious nature at Wadhwan (near Bombay), Amritsar, Multan and other parts of Punjab.

In May there were further riots at Amritsar and in Sind. In June and July there were riots at Moradabad and at Meerut as well as Allahabad and Ajmer. In August and September there were further outbreaks of riots of distressing character at Amritsar, Panipat Jabulpur, Gonda, Agra and Rae Bareilly. Most serious of all was disturbance which occurred at Sharanpur in connection with the Moharram celebration, being accompanied by murder, arson and loot on an unprecedented scale.

In 1924 terrible riots with most tragic consequences occurred at Delhi, Nagpur, Lahore, Lucknow, Moradabad Gulbarga, Bhagalpur and Kohat in the North West Frontier Province.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. ~~For details of these communal riots~~ B.R. Ambedkar: Pakistan or the Partition of India P.153-145.

Conclusion:

Ironically the vigorous efforts on the parts of the Indian Muslim for the preservation and defence of the Khilafat failed on account of its abolition by Mustafa Kemal and this also gave a fatal blow to the Khilafat movement as well as organization. Syed Amir Ali and His Highness Aga Khan wrote a letter to General Ismet Pasha, Prime Minister of Turkey, in which they pointed out the disturbing effects of the uncertain position of the Khalifa-Imam. The diminution of the Khalifa's dignity and prestige, it was observed, would be a loss to Islam as they had been great moral cohesive force. The Turks were urged to maintain the religious and moral solidarity of Islam by placing the Khilafat which would...<sup>1</sup> commend the confidence and esteem on a basis of the Muslim nations<sup>1</sup>, of the world. Although the letter was written in a moderate tone, yet when it was published, even before it was read by the person to whom it was addressed, in the Turkish newspapers, most of which happened at that time opposed to the Government of Angora, the Turkish Government suspected that the letter

---

1. Arnold Toynbee; Survey of International Affairs Appendix. 1.

was written at the instigation of the British government which was credited with the desire to see the Turkish Republic overthrown.<sup>1</sup>

Mustafa Kamal Pasha told the Turkish Grand National Assembly that the Republic was threatened and it must be maintained at all costs. On his proposals the Assembly abolished Khilafat on March 4, 1924 and expelled Khalifa Abdul Majid together with his family from Turkey. Almost all Khilafat leaders, with the exception of Maulana Azad, Hakim Ajmal Khan and a few others condemned Kamal Pasha and the Turkish National Assembly vigorously and characterised the action of the Turks as a betrayal of Islam. Many of them even advocated a social boycott of the New Turkish Republic and its leaders for this anti-Islamic act. The Central Khilafat Committee and the Jamiat-Ulema sent a joint Cable to Mustafa Kamal Pasha on 12th, March 1924 in which they informed him that the abolition of Khilafat had caused deep distress and consternation among Indian Muslims and appealed<sup>to</sup>/him to reconsider this decision. Permission was

---

1. Indian Quarterly Register 1924 Vol.1 p.85-96.

also sought for the visit of a delegation of Indian Muslims to Angora to make a fuller representation on the subject.<sup>1</sup> But the entreaties of the Muslims of India on behalf of Khilafat had no effect whatever upon the Turks and they refused to reconsider their decision. The Turkish Government even declined to receive the Indian Muslim delegation to Angora. This caused a deep disappointment among Indian Muslims who had suffered so much for the cause of the Khilafat.

---

1. Indian Quarterly Register Vol.1. 1924 p.85-96.

CHAPTER - V:

A REVIEW OF THE MOVEMENT

### A Review of the Movement

The Khilafat movement, the origin and development of which has been discussed in the preceding pages, moved the Indian Muslims and Hindus and other communities of India to agitate for the future preservation of Turkey after her defeat in the first world war, when the Allied powers decided to dismember her empire in violation of their solemn promises made earlier during the war. These assurances had been given to win the Muslim support for the prosecution of the war. Indian Muslims influenced by the Pan-Islamic sentiments and the teaching of Islam resolved to oppose any peace settlement which aimed at adversely affecting either the spiritual powers or depriving the Khalifa of his temporal powers. ✓ There was a considerable unrest among Muslims in Egypt, Central Asia and India over the future of Turkey. ✓ But the agitation for the defence of Turkish empire reached its climax in India.

The Khilafat movement advented in 1919. The agitation in the beginning was confined to the intellectual and educated Muslims in India who came forward with appeals and memorials to the then British Government demanding the safety and preservation of the Khilafat. The same year witnessed a Hindu-Muslim alliance over Khilafat under the



guidance of Mahatma Gandhi who launched the Satyagrah movement for opposing the Rowlatt bills. He attempted to make a united front of Hindus and Muslims over the issue of Khilafat against the British Government- their common foe/- and this movement <sup>thus</sup> became a mass movement and <sup>it</sup> no longer remained confined to classes.

The Allies gathered at Paris to draw up the peace treaty which they wanted to dictate to Turkey. /The Khilafat leaders of India pointed out to the Muslim masses of India towards great dangers which Turkey had to face on account of the harsh peace treaty of Sevres. They were told that the Europeans were determined to darken the political future of the Khalifa of Islam in Turkey. They came to know of the terms of the harsh peace treaty which was retaliatory nature and wanted to punish Turkey for her crime of fighting on the side of Germany in the war. / The Muslims now fully realized that the future of the Khilafat was doomed. The Ali Brothers were the most prominent leaders who took up the Khilafat cause. They organized the Khilafat movement on a solid footing by having a working formula with Mahatma Gandhi who united the Khilafatists and the congressmen preaching his new doctrine of non-violence and non-cooperation. /

Having adopted the doctrine of non-cooperation the Central Khilafat Committee and the Indian National Congress worked together to make the movement a success. Hindus and Muslims forgot their petty differences and joined hands. The slogan, 'Hindu Muslim Ki Jai' was heard every where. A section of Muslims especially in the Punjab resorted to Hijarat and migrated to Afghanistan. The British Government tried to suppress the movement through repressive measures when it observed that the movement was gaining momentum and was becoming stronger day by day. First of all the Ali Brothers were arrested and convicted on the charges of sedition, conspiracy and tampering with the loyalty of troops. Afterwards when the Prince of Wales came to India and his visit was unanimously boycotted by the Indian leaders, very many prominent leaders of Khilafat and congress were put behind the prison bars. Thousands of Indians who were the members of these two organisations also followed them. Public meetings were banned and volunteer organisations were declared illegal by the Government in India. All sorts of repressive measures were adopted. The Congress decided

to retaliate by starting civil disobedience movement under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi. When the civil disobedience movement was about to start, a bolt fell from the blue at Chauri-Chaura in Gorakhpur district of U.P. where the mob indulged in violence and burnt a number of police constables in the police station. The Mahatma suspended the movement on the ground that the country was not prepared. Thus suspension went to kill this movement and caused demoralisation among the rank and file of Khilafat and Congress organisations.

In the meantime the Turkish nationalists refused to accept the <sup>extremely</sup> degrading and humiliating peace treaty and became determined to offer resistance to the Allied powers and the Sultan-Khalifa-Waheed Uddin who was their puppet for all practical matters. Great Britain made up its mind to impose peace treaty upon Turkey by instigating the Greeks against Turkey and supplying <sup>to</sup> them arms and ammunition. Mustafa Kamal Pasha along with his fellow men put up a gallant fight inflicted a crushing defeat upon the Greeks. This compelled the British and other Allied powers to revise the humiliating and harsh treaty of Sevres by means of fresh treaty with Turkey which was signed at Lausanne. This new treaty met the major demands

of Turkish nationalists and virtually conceded what they wanted and for which they had fought so valiantly for more than two years. The decisive victory of Turks removed all apprehensions of Indian Muslims with regard to the future of Turkey and this also contributed to the collapse of Khilafat movement in India.

Subsequently the Turks started to look towards the institution of Khilafat with contempt. The modernists and extreme nationalists among them held this to be an out-of-date and out moded institution and felt that no useful purpose would be served by continuing this institution. They were not at all influenced by Pan Islamic feelings. They, therefore, first took away the political authority of the Khalifa and deprived him of all temporal authority and later on they abolished the institution altogether. This action proved to be a fatal blow to the Khilafat movement in India.

An accurate and dispassionate appraisal of the Khilafat movement in India has not yet been made by any scholar. The general attitude of a number of scholars and authors has been either of neglect or indifference. They see nothing noteworthy or praise worthy in the movement and call it a dismal failure and grossly under value its significance. No doubt the movement could not succeed in its objects. It has to be admitted that the

movement had its great importance and was not a total failure. It had taught a lesson to the world that a wrong must be opposed no matter how much hardship one has to suffer and that a foreign government can not suppress the national sentiments of its subject people. This movement had made Indians not only politically conscious but intensely nationalist. It gave a new leadership and went to revolutionize Indian politics. Now started the era of mass movement. The Khilafat organization was a mass organization. The complexion of the congress also underwent a radical change. Now its membership was opened to all and it became a mass organization. Before 1919, it was an upper middle class organization now it became a full fledged national organization because the Muslims had joined it enblock under the leadership of the Ali brothers in December, 1919. The branches of Congress and Khilafat organizations were established in all the cities, towns and rural areas of the country. For the membership of both the organizations it was compulsory to wear hand-spun Khadi or Garaha. Not only the members of these organizations but a very large number of supporters of the Khilafat non-cooperation movement gave up the British Cloth and began to use Khadi and Garaha. This went to adversely affect the sale of the British cloth in India. It went to make Indian people

bold and they no longer feared the British Government. It aroused among them strong feelings of nationalism and put an end to slave mentality. It also went to make Indians hate the English ways of life and foreign things. This movement opened a new era in Indian politics. Now politics began to have a deep religious tinge. In all the meetings of Khilafat, speeches were delivered which contained the quotations of the Quran and Hadith and most of the leaders both Hindus and Muslims were religious in their outlook. There was a thorough change in the leadership. Now instead of well dressed leaders who led a luxuriant life and kept themselves quite aloof from the masses, these were leaders who belonged to middle classes or were the Maulvis, Gwamis and other religious leaders who freely mixed with the people and who led a simple life. They spoke in the language of the people. Most of them were devoted to the cause of Khilafat and suffered a lot. Their integrity and devotion deeply influenced the people and accounted for their popularity.

There are a number of reasons as to why the Khilafat movement failed to attract the attention of scholars or became a subject of indifference. The first victory of Turks over the Greeks; the signing of the treaty of Lausanne; the abolition of the Khilafat by the Turks and finally the emergence of an independent stable Turkish

Republic under the leadership of Mustafa Kamal Pasha impressed these scholars to ignore the Khilafat agitation altogether and led them to believe that Khilafat movement was frivolous and that the Turks had achieved their objects only through their victory over Greeks and that the agitation of Indian Muslims had no effect at any state upon the Turkish settlement. This is no doubt a very unfair view.

The importance of the Khilafat movement lies in the Indian national movement on the following grounds:-

✓ The Indian Muslims showed wonderful energy, zeal and capacity to suffer and to make tremendous sacrifices to attain their Pan-Islamic aims and objectives through their strong appeals to the British Government and by their mass demonstration and by defying the Government.

The movement brought about from 1910-1924 anti- British atmosphere and feelings among Muslims who had been loyal to the British Government under the leadership of ✓ Sir Syed Ahmad Khan and his school known as the Aligarh school who <sup>were</sup> in their turn /under the deep influence of the British die-hard bureaucrats who had advocated Muslim-British collaboration in opposing the Indian nationalist movement. The Muslims of India had been not only loyal to the British but extremely hostile to Hindus. This policy had been laid down by Syed Ahmad Khan and had been

Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk and Viqar-ul-Mulk who felt that the future of Muslims lay with the British and the end of the British empire would mean that the Muslims were doomed.<sup>1</sup> They regarded British as their life saviour against majority community. The British also helped Muslims to keep them away from <sup>the Indian</sup> national movement. ✓

The birth of the Muslim league, the partition of Bengal and the grant of separate electorate to the Muslims were the steps taken to align the Muslims against Indian nationalism. The anti-Turkish policy of the British Government changed the policy of Indian Muslims towards the British government as well as towards Hindu majority community. Indian Muslims came closer to Hindus and became anti-British and feelings of nationalism cropped up in their minds. Patriotic feelings and ideas became more popular among Indian Muslims during Great War when Turkey fought against England taking the side of Germany. The Muslim League had adopted the goal of local self government for India in 1912.

---

1. Zubairi, M. Amine: Hayat-i-Mohsin P.157.

2. Nadvi, M. Ikram Ullah: Viqar Hayat, PP.675-692.



While the war was going on, the Indian Muslims were under the impression that Great Britain would adopt sympathetic attitude towards Turkey. They were disillusioned when at the end of the war Great Britain adopted a very harsh policy towards Turkey and it wanted to dismember it. This attitude of the British went finally to alienate the Muslims and they became very much anti-British and they started the Khilafat movement to get favourable terms for the Turks and to defend the holy places of Islam at the Paris peace conference which was organised by Great Britain.

This movement caused a considerable anxiety to the British Government. The agitation went to make Indian people especially Indian Muslims intensely anti-British and went also to make them bold. They no longer feared the Government. The leaders of this movement openly spread the feelings of disaffection against the Government very strong feelings of nationalism arose Indians When Gandhiji decided to fight for the Khilafat cause, this went to cement the bond of union between Hindus and Muslims. They were now united over fighting against the Punjab wrongs and for the defence and protection of the Khilafat. Championing a purely Muslim religious question by Gandhiji and other non Muslim leaders very much went to change the Muslim politics. Now they felt very much obliged to their Hindu brethren and they drew closer to them. This opened a new chapter in the Hindu Muslim relation.

The coalition of the Khilafat with the Congress proved to a great threat to the existence of British authority in India although their movement was entirely peaceful. The Indian people became very much disloyal to the Government. The boycott of foreign goods and the bitterness between India and British akin to that which spread during mutiny of 1857, the anti-Government speeches and demonstrations ~~and~~ violently anti-British volunteer organization <sup>of</sup> the Khilafat and the congress and the possibility of an invasion by Afghanistan with the assistance of Bolshevik Russia caused a very serious threat to the British rule in India. This caused a considerable anxiety to the British Government.

The British Government on account of Khilafat Congress alliance had to be favourable to Turkey in order to appease Indian Muslims. The Khilafat movement is very important in the Indian freedom struggle as it led to the launching the famous non-cooperation movement which was in fact the first mass nonviolent struggle of Indians against the British government. This movement had been launched by the Khilafat organization in collaboration with the congress with great enthusiasm and zeal and for

a time it went to shake the foundation of the British Government. The programme of non-cooperation movement had a great effects on legislatures, law courts and educational institutions. It gave a great impetus to Swadeshi movement and the programme of boycott of foreign goods went to adversely affect on the sale of foreign cloth in particular. British commercial and manufacturing interests this suffered a great financial loss on this account.

Indian masses became united and forgot their differences. The Muslim league and other communal organizations became dormant for about four years. The non-cooperation movement enthused the Indian masses to carry on the struggle for the political emancipation of their motherland. This movement generated the feelings of fearlessness and infused the spirit of intense nationalism among Indian people. Prior to the advent of the non-cooperation movement the Indian national movement i.e. the Indian National Congress was confined only to urban areas. The non-cooperation movement gave a new colour to Indian politics and Indian national movement assumed the shape of a mass movement. It changed the complexion of leadership,

Formerly, the leadership belonged to the top upper classes now it came largely in the hands of middle classes. It is however regrettable that the exact relationship between the non-cooperation campaign and the Khilafat movement has not been properly understood by very many writers of Indian History. These writers say that non-co-operation movement had been launched by Mahatma Gandhi for the achievement of Swaraj and redress of Punjab wrongs and that the Khilafat movement was a subsidiary issue in that campaign. Mahatma Gandhi, on the other hand, had very clearly stated in his 'Young India' dated 27th October, 1921 that he contemplated non-cooperation in connection with the Khilafat question. Mahatma Gandhi linked it (The Khilafat question) with the demand of Swaraj to enlarge the sphere of the movement and to attract Hindus.

✓ The Khilafatists in the beginning had before them this great objective of preserving of integrity of the ottoman or Turkish empire. It is evident from the various phases of the peace settlement between Turkey and the Allies that the Khilafat movement played an important role and had much to do in shaping the balance for the benefit of Turkey. It is wrong to think as some scholars think that Khilafat

movement was a total failure and it could not achieve its objectives e.g., the preservation of integrity of Turkish empire. The victory of Turks over the Greeks was no doubt responsible for the replacement of unjust and harsh peace treaty of Sevres by the treaty of Lousanne whereby the Turks regained their homeland. But it must also be recognized that the Khilafat movement was responsible in shaping the Near Eastern policy of Great Britain. The British Cabinet had to adopt this policy on account of the Khilafat agitation in India and Mr. Montague the then Secretary of State of India had to take notice of it. The British Government could not ignore the intense feelings of the Indian Muslims over the Khilafat and they could not afford to have total alienation of Muslims.

✓ The influence of the Khilafat movement on the settlement of Turkey can be noticed in these matters. First of all the British Cabinet had to allow the Sultan of Turkey to have his administration at constantinople. Secondly the British Cabinet prevented the British Prime-Minister Mr. Lloyd George from providing financial and military aid to Greece which could have strengthened the Greek armies in Greek-Turkish war and could not at least prolonged it. Thirdly in the declaration at the Lausanne conference that the Turkish homeland would be restored to the Turks.

The Khilafat movement was also responsible in giving new shape to Britain's Arab policy. Great Britain had to change her Arab policy a lot to pacify Indian Muslim. The Khilafat movement in this way, presented the first and foremost notable example of that Indian opinion was a force in world politics, and was responsible in changing the policy of Great Britain.

The movement, however, had its short comings as well which went to affect Indian politics adversely. One such short coming was that this movement was the outcome of intensely religious and purely sentimental and that it gave birth to religious revivalism and very much encouraged both the Hindu and Muslim religious revivalism. This movement arose out of Pan-Islamic feelings of Indian Muslims who have had been very particular of everything relating to Islam. The demand for favourable peace talks for Turkey by the Indian Muslims was largely dictated by Pan-Islamic feelings sharing the cries of the statesmen of old Turkey who tried to gain sympathy of Muslims in foreign lands. It is noteworthy on the part of Indian Muslims that the Pan-Islamic propaganda of Turkey could not have such effect on the Muslims of other countries except Indian Muslims. The Indian Muslims were much

impressed by the Pan-Islamic propaganda and launched the Khilafat movement for which they had to suffer tremendously psychologically, physically and materially.

The Khilafat movement was based upon a somewhat unreal foundation. The Muslims of India who had started this movement were very keen for the restoration of the Khilafat with all the powers and dignity of its head- the Khalifa. While the Turks, who had been as the chief operators of the institution of Khilafat for centuries no longer felt its utility and considered it to be mediæval, burden some, out dated, stagnant and useless institution. To them this was a cause of constant friction and the root cause of their troubles with European Powers. It led to foreign interference in their own affairs and considered it as a stumbling block in the way of the integrity and solidarity of their country.

Therefore the Turks finally abolished it. This decision of the Turks was very much disliked and vehemently condemned by the Indian Khilafatists. The Turks were of the opinion that the Khilafat had outlived its utility from the point of view of their national interests. A section of Muslims of other countries, held this view that the office of the Khalifa instead of uniting the Muslims of the world had gone to divide the Muslims.

The Indian Muslims could not distinguish between the ideal and actual aspect of the Khilafat. Leaving aside the period of Khilafat-e-Rashida and with the exception of Umar bin Abdul Aziz many of the Khalifas were far from being ideal rulers and the 19th and 20th centuries saw the degeneration of the Khilafat. It had become an agency for exploiting the religious sentiments of Muslims. The degenerate Khalifas had practically done no good for the Islam or the Muslims of the world. The Turks, therefore, decided to concentrate all their efforts in consolidating their own country and work for its political and economic stability of their country and have nothing to do with the Pan-Islamism at all. In India, on the other hand, the Khilafat leaders emphasised the needs and importance of the Khilafat. The demands of the Indian Muslims about the Khilafat were so effective and efficacious that Great Britain or the Allied could not ignore them. The Khilafatists of India showed themselves to be more zealous than the Turks and Arabs themselves in so far as the defence and protection of the Khilafat was concerned.



The Central Khilafat Committee of India put forward such demands before the Allies which were far wider and more complicated than those of the Turkish Government and of the National Assembly of Angora who kept only their national interests and did not care for the interests of the Muslims of other countries. In fact they thought only in terms of Turks and not in terms of Muslims. ~~not in terms of Muslims~~ They were interested in having only the Turkish part of the former ottoman empire under them plus the area in and around the constantinople in the European continent. While status qua or the restoration of the pre-war empire of Turkey was the demand of the Indian Khilafatists.\* These demands had been formulated in order to preserve the integrity, position and powers of the Khalifa. Their demands were also related about preservation of the sanctity and the importance of Jazirat-ul-Arab and the holy places of Islam according to the injunctions of the Shariat. They completely ignored this that the Turks no longer stood for these demands and they were interested only in such a peace settlement which could satisfy their national demands.

✓ The Khilafat movement was responsible for giving religious colour to political questions. Apart from this the demands of the Indian Khilafatists were in

a way in conflict with the national demands and aspirations of the Arabs. The Arabs had long suffered under Turkish rule and desired total separation from Turkish control. They wanted to have their national states. They had grievances of discrimination and misrule etc. against the Turks and to them the ottoman or Turkish rule was a rule of oppression. The Khilafatists of India showed little sympathy for the right of self determination to christian minorities residing in the Turkish Empire who had suffered under the Turks. The British Premier Mr. Lloyd George expressed this in these words, "Nor are we fighting to deprive Turkey of its capital or of the rich and renowned land of Asia Minor and Thrace which are pre-dominantly Turkish in race. We do not challenge the maintenance of the Turkish empire in the home lands of the Turkish race with its capital at constantinople." <sup>✓</sup> But he also stood for the internationalizing and neutralizing of the passage between the Mediterranean and the Black Sea and neutralised Arabia, Armenia, Mesopotamia, Syria and Palestine were to be completely separated from Turkey. ✓

✓ The Khilafat movement had succeeded in forging about Hindu Muslim unity for a short period. But with the collapse or fizzling out of this movement this unity began to weaken and serious dissensions between Hindus and Muslims arose which led <sup>to</sup> the outbreak of communal riots. Between 1900 to 1922 there were 16 communal riots in India and from 1923 to 1926 they rose to 72. These figures show that the unity between the two communities during Khilafat agitation was short lived and did not establish a more permanent bond of union between the two major communities. It was the outcome of the common hatred against their common foreign enemy - the English rulers. Differences cropped up in the minds of their leaders with regard to technique to be followed for the pursuit of political object. ✓ In Mianwali Jail, the Muslim's Dastarkhawan attracted young Hindu prisoners and they began to have their meals with their Muslim brethren, discarding the untouchability or Hindu orthodoxy. This inter-dinning brought them closer to the Muslims. This was too much for Swami Shardha Nand- the great Arya Samaji leader who was also in the same jail. To him this was nothing but de Hinduization and quite fatal to Hindu revivalism for

---

~~\*Tablaxx~~ Dastarkhawan - the Muslim way of lunch and supper.

which he stood. He exhorted the Hindu congress-men not to dine with Muslim brethren as this would go to pollute them and go to make them Muslims. This interdinning amounted to conversion to Islam or de-Hinduization. The young Hindu Congressites did not pay any heed to his exhortation. On this account, he gave up all his sympathy for the Khilafat cause and now considered it to be the most harmful and dangerous to Hindu interests, and became one of its main adversaries. He was of the view that this sort of freedom movement which led to interdinning of Hindus and Muslims was suicidal to Hindu Dharma and therefore he could not be a party to it. Consequently he withdrew from the non-co-operation movement, and in a dramatic way he was released from the Mian Wali Jail. After his release he started his Shuddhi movement. This proved to be fatal to Hindu-Muslim unity. The Shuddhi movement aimed at converting Muslims or bringing back the Muslims whose ancestors or forefathers had embraced Islam long ago to the fold of Hindus while the Sangh movement aimed at organizing the Hindus against Muslims as according to the Swami Hindus were weak in every respect and they were hopelessly divided<sup>1</sup>.

---

1. Ludhianvi, Aziz-ur-Rehman: Rais-ul-Ihrar pp.110-111.Tr.

Thus the Hindu Muslim Unity received a fatal blow.  
The Khilafat movement is significant from one other important angle and it is the revolutionary change that it had brought about in Indian politics. It was on account of this movement that the Indian national movement now became a mass movement.

The Muslims were very much sensitive about the ottoman empire which combined in it the Khilafat as to them it represented the glory and the political power of Islam. So when it suffered a defeat at the hands of the Allied power and also because of the Arab rebellion the Muslims got restless. To them the integrity of the ottoman empire was of paramount importance.

All these events had their effects over the Muslim politics of the world and the Indian Muslims could not escape the impacts <sup>of</sup> this great set back and international change in the global position.

Meanwhile in India the struggle for national independence or Swaraj was in the offing and what gave an impetus to this was the Muslim alliance with the Hindus against the common enemy i.e. British imperialism. Thus the khilafat agitation and non-cooperation movement telescoped each other and a mass upheaval took place

dealing with the boycott of foreign goods, total disobedience to government orders, defiance of its authority and violation of its laws. The Khilafat agitation became very strong largely on account of the dynamic personalities of the Ali Brothers, Maulana Mahmud-ul-Hasan, Abdul Bari of Farangi Mahal, Abul Kalam Azad, Dr. Ansari and many other prominent Muslim leaders and the cooperation which they got from Gandhiji and the other Hindu leaders against the common enemy. The support which it received from Hindus went to make this still stronger. Gandhiji was convinced of the justice of the Muslim cause. He stated:-

"I am bound as an Indian to share the sufferings and trials of fellow Indians. If I deem the Mohammedan to be my brother, it is my duty to help him in this hour of trial to the best of my ability, if his cause commends itself to me as just!"<sup>1</sup>

But as the ill luck could have it. The results of the war proved that the movement could not achieve its objects. It was a dismal picture which the Indians found

---

1. Young India June 2, 1920.

and specifically the Muslims. There was nothing but love's labour lost. It will be interesting to note that while the Indians were apparently fighting unitedly, unfortunately, there was not so much of unity. There was a lot of apprehension among some Hindu leaders. They feared that Muslims would be benefitted more since Muslims dominated this movement. So this section of Hindu leadership was very much hesitant and they were not whole heartedly with the movement.

Muslims had pinned high hopes on the pledges which the British Prime-Ministers, Asquith and Lloyd George, and the British Viceroy, Hardinge, had given about the holy places, the integrity of Turkish empire and independence of Muslim holyland, but after the war all these pledges had been thrown aside this caused gloom among Muslims.

The importance of the pledges was because the Indian Muslim troops had fought against the Turkish Muslim army in the various theatre of the war in the hope that they would be implemented. But the British forces operating in the Middle East had not spared the holy places. Above all, the treaty of Sevres threatened

to break Turkey into shreds, the Greeks were incited to grab even the homelands of the Turks; the Arab Provinces of Turkey Syria and Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq were placed under French and British mandates, Palestine was assigned to Jews as their national home, and Egypt was wrenched from the Turkish empire and made a British protectorate. This caused the total Muslim alienation from the British and Muslims became very much anti British.

One has to conclude that the Indian people put up a gallant fight against the mighty British Government and faced the repression cheerfully and with courage, but the final setting of the drama in the theatre of war was much more brackish from many angles. Here one thing should be specifically noted that Indian Muslims support was for the Khalifa. They hated Sharif Husain of Mecca who was the most important Arab Chieftain.

The collapse of the Khilafat movement had been preceded by the end of ottoman empire and by the elevation of Sharif Husain of Mecca as the ruler of the Kingdom of Hijaz and of his sons Faisal and Abdul Ullah as kings of Iraq and Trans-Jordan the British Government tried to project Sharif Husain as the leader of the Muslim world; Indian Muslims suffered a great financial loss



owing to the unplanned non-cooperation movement which was more of a sentimental movement. Finally the British diplomacy triumphed and Pan-Islamism received a set back. Turkey no longer remained a Muslim power. It was now more of a Turkish state. The failure of the Khilafat movement went to weaken the Khilafat leadership in India as well as the national leadership. After the collapse of the movement started the era of communal riots and Hindu-Muslim animosity. The Khilafat leaders could not check this mounting communal animosity and thus Hindu-Muslim Unity came to an end. Despite this the significance and importance of this movement cannot in anyway be ignored or minimized. This movement had revolutionized Indian politics and in fact it had hastened the national freedom. Had there been no Khilafat movement, Hindus and Muslims would never have come closer, the Swadeshi and Khadi would not have received any encouragement, the slavish mentality of Indians would have remained, the self respect and self confidence of Indians would not have been enhanced, and the congress would have remained a body of white-collared people representing only the upper classes with a very small Muslim membership and it would never have become a mass national organization, its leadership would have remained in the hands of such leaders who had no contact with the masses, there would have been the same fear and awe of the British Government and probably Gandhiji would not have become a mass leader and the authority

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

NEWS PAPERS AND PERIODICALS

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. Aftab,                              | Lahore, 1921 and 1922.                          |
| 2. Akhbare-e-Islam,                    | Bombay, 1920 and 1921.                          |
| 3. Akhbar Saudagar,                    | Meerut, 1911 and 1912.                          |
| 4. Tanzeem,                            | Amritsar, 1920 to 1922.                         |
| 5. Alamgir,                            | Aligarh, 1911 and 1912.                         |
| 6. Al-Amine,                           | Hyderabad 1920 and 1912.                        |
| 7. Al-Haq,                             | Sukkur, 1920 and 1921.                          |
| 8. Al-Hilal,                           | Calcutta, 1911 to 1914.                         |
| 9. Al-Islam,                           | Allahabad, 1911 and 1912.                       |
| 10. Aligarh Gazettee,                  | Aligarh, 1921 and 1922.                         |
| 11. Aligarh Institute Gazettee,        | Aligarh, 1909, 1912, 1915, 1920, 1921 and 1922. |
| 12. Aligarh Monthly,                   | Aligarh, 1912 to 1915.                          |
| 13. Al-Wahid,                          | Karachi, 1922.                                  |
| 14. Bande Mataram,                     | Lahore, 1920 to 1922.                           |
| 15. Bombay Chronicle,                  | Bombay, 1920 and 1921.                          |
| 16. Bombay Samachar,                   | Bombay, 1922.                                   |
| 17. Citizen,                           | Madras, 1920.                                   |
| 18. Comrade,                           | Calcutta & Delhi, 1911, 1912, 1923 and 1924.    |
| 19. Daily Telegraph and Deccan Herald, | Poona, 1920.                                    |

20. Dnyan Prakash, Poona and Bombay, 1918, 1919 and 1920.
21. East and West, Bombay, 1915.
22. Edinburgh Review, London, 1914.
23. Gujarati, Bombay, 1920 and 1922.
24. Hamdam, Lucknow, 1916 to 1923.
25. Hamdard, Delhi, 1912, 1913, 1914, 1926, 1927 and 1928.
26. Hindusthan, Bombay, 1920 to 1922.
27. Hindusthan Review, Allahabad, 1915, 1920, 1921, 1922 and 1923.
28. Hitavida, Nagpur, 1920 and 1921.
29. Independent, Allahabad, 1921.
30. India, London, 1919 and 1920.
31. Indian Quarterly Register, Calcutta, 1924 to 1926.
32. Indian Review, Madras, 1911, 1912, 1913, 1914, 1917, 1918, 1920 to 1925.
33. Indian Social Reformer, Bombay, 1920.
34. Indu Prakash, Bombay, 1920.
35. Insaaf, Bombay, 1921.
36. Islamic Culture, Hyderabad, 1927 to 1929.
37. Islamic Mail, Bombay, 1914.
38. Isha'at-i-Islam, Lahore, 1919 and 1920.
39. Ittihad Islam, Moradabad, 1911 and 1912.
40. Jame-e-Jamshed, Bombay, 1918 to 1921.

41. Janama Bhumii, Andhradesa, 1919.
42. Kesari, Poona, 1920.
43. Kaiser-i-Hind, Bombay, 1919 to 1921.
44. Khilafat, Bombay, 1921 to 1923.
45. Lender, Allahabad, 1919 to 1923.
46. Loksangraha, Poona, 1920 and 1921.
47. London Times, London, 1919 to 1923.
48. Medina, Bijnore, (U.P.) 1919 to 1923.
49. Modern Review, Calcutta, 1914, 1917, 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921, 1922, 1923 and 1924.
50. Mufid-i-Am, Agra, 1911 and 1912.
51. Mufid-e-Rozgar, Bombay 1918 to 1920.
52. Muslim Herald, Bombay 1922 to 1924.
53. Muslim Outlook, London, 1919 and 1920.
54. Muslim University Gazettees, Aligarh, 1924.
55. Muslim Review, Allahabad, 1911 to 1915.
56. Nav Jivan, Ahmedabad, 1920.
57. Naye Roshni, Allahabad, 1915 to 1919.
58. New India, Madras, 1920.
59. New Times, Karachi, 1920 and 1921.
60. Nineteenth Century, London, 1921 and 1922.
61. Nusrat, Amritsar, 1920 to 1922.
62. Observer, Lahore, 1913.

- |                                |                                      |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 63. Oudh Punch,                | Lucknow, 1911 and 1912.              |
| 64. Political Bhomyo,          | Ahmedabad, 1918 to 1920.             |
| 65. Praja Bandhu,              | Ahmedabad, 1912 to 1920.             |
| 66. Praja Mitra & Parsi,       | Bombay, 1920 and 1921.               |
| 67. Riyasat,                   | Delhi, 1927 to 1929.                 |
| 68. Roznama-e-Khilafat,        | Bombay, 1920 to 1922.                |
| 69. Sadaye Muslim,             | Kanpur, 1921 to 1924.                |
| 70. Sanj Vartman,              | Bombay, 1920 and 1922.               |
| 71. Search light,              | Bihar, 1920.                         |
| 72. Servant of India,          | Poona, 1920.                         |
| 73. Sadaqat                    | Lahore, 1921.                        |
| 74. Sind Observer,             | Karachi, 1920 to 1922.               |
| 75. Siyasat,                   | Lahore, 1920.                        |
| 76. Sultan ul-Akbar,           | Bombay, 1911 to 1923.                |
| 77. Taj,                       | Jubbulpore, 1921 and 1922.           |
| 78. The Advocate,              | Lucknow 1912 to 1914.                |
| 79. The Asiatic Review,        | Calcutta, 1915, 1916, 1917 and 1920. |
| 80. The British Empire Review, | London, 1919.                        |
| 81. The Times of India,        | Bombay, 1915 to 1918.                |
| 82. Ukhawat,                   | Calcutta, 1919.                      |
| 83. Urdu-i-Mualla,             | Aligarh, 1911 to 1913.               |
| 84. Vakil,                     | Amritsar, 1921.                      |
| 85. Wafadar,                   | Navasari, 1922.                      |

86. Young India, Ahmedabad, 1919 to 1925.  
87. Zamindar, Lahore, 1913, 1914, 1915,  
1916, 1919, 1920 and 1921.

Government Papers

Records of the Government of India, Home Department,  
Political Section from the year 1911 to 1920.

Confidential Reports on the Non-cooperation and  
Khilafat Movement, by Deputy Director, Intelligence  
Bureau, Home Department, Government of India (1925).

\*\*\*\*\*

Arabic, Persian and Urdu Work

1. Ali Muttaqi, Hindi : 'Kunzul Amaal' (Arabic)
2. Ahmad, Syed Tufail : Musalmano Ka Roshni Mustaqbil,  
Nizami Press Badaun, 1938.
3. Ahmad, Syed Zahoor : Masala-i-Khilafat-wa Britanvi  
mul ka Boycott.  
Khilafat Publicity Board Jabalpur
4. Arif, Anwar, ed : Azad ki Taqirren.  
Addi Dunya Delhi.
5. " " " : Tehrik Azadi  
Maktaba Mahaul, Lahore.
6. Ashraf, Mohd Gulshan : Alnoor.  
Muslim University Institute  
Aligarh, 1921.
7. Azad, AbulKalam : Taza Muzamin.  
Qoami Darul Ishaat Meerut.
8. " " : Haqalat-e-Abul Kalam Azad.  
Darul Ishaat, Karachi.
9. " " : Tabbarakat-e-Azad  
Usmania Book Depct, Hyderabad.
10. " " : Khilafat.  
Islamiat Series, Lahore.
11. " " : Masali-i-Khilafat.  
Hali Publishing House, Delhi.
12. " " : Masali Khilafat wa Jazirautal Arab  
Albilagh Press, Lucknow.
13. " " : Higarishat Azad.  
Maktaba Mahaul, Delhi.

14. Azizur- Rehman Jamei : Rais-ul-ahrar- Maulana Habibur  
Rehman Ludhianvi aur Hindustan Ki  
Jang Azadi.  
Press Gali Saudagaran, Delhi, 1961
15. Bedauni, Maulana  
Abdul Majid : Darso- Khilafat.  
Khilafat Usmania Darul Ishaat wa  
Tijarat Deoband, Sharapur.
16. " " : Al - Izhar  
Khilafat Usmania Darul Ishaat-wa-  
Tijarat Deoband, Sharapur.
17. " " : Al - Maktoob  
Khilafat Usmania Darul Ishaat-wa-  
Tijarat Deoband, Sharapur.
18. Bilasuri : Fateh-ul-Baldan (Arabic)
19. Daryabadi, Maulana  
Abdul Majid : Mohammad Ali, Zati  
Diary Ke Chand Varg  
2 Vols, Darul Mussanifin,  
Azamgarh.
20. Ghazi, Hamidul Ansari: Islam Ka Nizam-e-Hokumat.  
Nadwatul Mussanifin, Delhi.
21. Hali, Maulana  
Altaf Husain : Hayat-e-Jawed  
Ashraf Press Lahore, 1966.
22. Husain, Abid, Dr. : Hindustani Musalman  
Ayana-e-Ayyam Mai Muktabah Jamia,  
New Delhi.
23. Husain, Mirza Akhtar : Tarikh Muslim League  
Muktab-i-League Bombay.
24. Ibn Athir : Tarikh-ul-Kamil (Arabic)
25. " " : Usad-ul-Ghaba (Arabic)
26. Ibn Hajar Asqalani : Fateh-ul-Fari (Arabic)



27. Ibn-i-Hisham : Sirat-ur Rasul Ullah  
Tr.by Maulana Abdul Jalil Siddique  
wa Ghulam Rasool, Lahore.
28. Ibn Khaldun : 'Muguddamah' (Arabic)  
Published in Egypt.
29. " " : -'Tarikh ul 'ibar' (Arabic)  
Published in Egypt.
30. Ibn Qaiyim : Zadul Ma'ad. (Arabic)
31. Ibn Sa'd : Tabagat-i-Kabir  
Tr. in urdu by Translation Bureau  
Usmania University Hyderabad.
32. Intikhab-e-Mazamin-e  
Jauhar : Published by  
Jamia Millia, Delhi.
33. Jafri, Aqeel Ahmad : Makalimat-i-Abul Kalam.  
Isha'at-i-Urdu, Hyderabad.
34. Jafri, Rais Ahmad : Maqalat-i-Mohammad Ali. 2 Vols.  
Idara-i-Isha'at-e-Urdu,  
Hyderabad Deccan.
35. " " " : Ifadat-i-Mohammad Ali  
Idara-i-Isha'at-e-Urdu,  
Hyderabad Deccan, 1945.
36. " " " : Wizarishat-i-Mohammad Ali  
Idara-i-Isha'at-e-Urdu.  
Hyderabad Deccan.
37. " " " : Sirat-i-Mohammad Ali  
Kitab Manzil, Lahore, 1950.
38. " " " : Ali Bradaran.  
Lahore, Mohammad Ali Academi, Tauhar  
Special series 1963.
39. Madni, Maulana  
Husain Ahmad : Naqsh-e-Hayat 2 Vols.  
Muktabaha Dinah, Deoband,  
Sharanpur, 1953-54.
40. " " : Safarnamai-Asir-i-Malta Deoband,  
Sharanpur.

41. Mahmood, Syed Dr. : Khilafat aur Englishtan  
Deoband, Sharanpur.
42. Mawardi : Al Ahkam-us Sultaniyah  
Tr. in urdu by Translation Bureau  
Usonia University, Hyderabad.
43. Mirza, Mohammad : Mussalman-i-Hind-Ki-Hayat-i-Sayasi.  
Kutub Khana Ilm o Adab, Delhi.
44. Mohammad Ikram, Sheikh : Raad-i-Kausar.  
Mercantile Press, Lahore.
45. " " : Mauj-i-Kausar .  
Mercantile Press, Lahore.
46. " " : Ab-i-Kausar  
Mercantile Press, Lahore.
47. " " : Chushama-i-Kausar  
Mercantile Press, Lahore.
48. Mohammad, Mien, Maulana : Ulema-e-Haq-Ki-Shandar Karama Vol(1)  
Al Jamiat Book Depot, Delhi.
49. Nadvi, Masood Alam : Hindustan Ki Pahli Islami Tahrik,  
Hyderabad.
50. Nadvi, Syed Suliman: Duniya-e-Islam aur Masalai Khilafat  
Khilafat Press, Bombay.
51. " " (ed) : Maqalat-i-Shibli  
Darul Mussanifin, Azamgarh.
52. " " : Khilafat aur Hindustan  
Darul Mussanifin, Azamgarh.
53. " " : Arab-O-Hind-Ke-Taluqqat.  
Hindustan Academi, Allahabad.
54. " " : Barid-i-Firsang Muktaba ul Sharik  
Karachi.
55. Nadvi, Abul Hasnat : Khilafat -i- Islamia aur Turk  
Darul Mussanifin, Azamgarh.
56. Nadvi, M. Ikram Ullah: Vigar Hayat.  
Published by Muslim Educational  
Conference, Aligarh.

57. Qazi, Abdul Chaffar : Hayat-i-Ajmal  
Anjuman Taraqqi-urdu-Hind, Aligarh.
58. " " : Asar-i-Abul Kalam  
Anjuman Taraqqi-urdu-Hind, Aligarh.
59. Sarwar, Mohammad : Hazameen Mohammad Ali 2 Vols,  
Maktab Jamia, Delhi.
60. " " : Maulana Mohammad Ali,  
Sindh Sagar Academy, Lahore.
61. " " : Maulana Mohammad Ali-Ka-Europe-Ka-  
Safar.  
Maktab-Jamia, Delhi.
62. Syuti, Jalaluddin : Tarikh-ul-Khulafa (Arabic)
63. Tabari, Ibn Jarir : Tarikh-ul Ummam  
Tr.in urdu by Translation Bureau  
Usmania University, Hyderabad.
64. Thanvi, Ashraf Ali, Maulana : The Quran, Translated in Urdu,  
Delhi, 1956.
65. Tufail, Mohammad, ed: Nuzoosh (Makateeb Number)  
Vol.(i) & (ii)  
Idarah Farooq Urdu, Lahore,
66. " " " : Nuzoosh (Shakhsiyat Number)  
Idarah Farooq Urdu, Lahore,  
October 1959-60.
67. " " " : Nuzoosh (Khutoot Number) Vol. (i),  
(ii) & (iii).  
Idarah Farooq Urdu, Lahore, April  
May 1968.
68. Zabair, M. Amine : Hayat-i-Mohsin.  
Published by Muslim University Press  
Aligarh, 1934.
69. " " " : Siyasat-e-Milliah Azizi Press,  
Agra, 1941.

# ENGLISH WORK

1. Abbot, G.F. : Turkey in Transition, London, 1909.
2. Afzal Iqbal : Select Writings and Speeches of Maulana Mohammad Ali, Lahore, 1944.
3. Agha Khan : India in Transition, New York, 1944.
4. Ahmad Mirza Mahmood : Non-Co-operation and Islam, Lahore, 1921.
5. Ahmad, Shafi : The first four Califs, Madras, 1923.
6. Ahmad, Shafi and Yakub Hasan : Mohammad, Madras, 1946.
7. Ahsan Ullah : History of the Muslim World, Calcutta, 1930.
8. Alexander, Powell, E : The struggle for power in Muslim Asia, London, 1925.
9. A.I.C.C. Publication : Congress and the Problem of Minorities, 1947.
10. " " " : Report of the Congress Civil Disobedience Enquiry Committee, 1923.
11. Ali, Ameer, Syed : The spirit of Islam, London, 1935.
12. " " " : A short history of Saracenes, London, 1934.
13. Ali, Mohammad, Maulana : My life: A fragment, edited by Afzal Iqbal and published by Sheikh M. Asraf, Lahore, 1946.
14. " " " : Freedom of faith and its price: the case of Messrs Shaukat Ali and Mohammad Ali, London, 1919.
15. Ali, Mohammad : (Of Lahore) Mohammad, the Prophet, Lahore, 1924.

16. Ali, Mohammad : Early Caliphate, Lahore, 1947.
17. " " : Tr. in English of the Holy Quran, Lahore, 1948.
18. " " : A Manual of Hadith. Ahmadia Anjuman Ishaat-i-Islam, Lahore.
19. Ali, Zakl : Islam in the World, Lahore, 1947.
20. Ambedkar, B.R. : Pakistan or the Partition of India, Bombay, 1946.
21. Amery, L.S. : India and freedom, Bombay, 1942.
22. Andrews, C.F. and Mukerjee : Rise and growth of Congress in India (1832-1920) Meerut, 1967.
23. Antonius, George : The Arab Awakening, New York, 1916.
24. Argus : Gandhism cum Non-Co-operation exposed, Assam, 1922.
25. Armstrong, H.C. : Grey Wolf (Mustafa Kemal an intimate study of a Dictator) London, 1937.
26. Arnold : The Caliphate, Oxford, 1924.
27. " : The Legacy of Islam, Oxford, 1943.
28. " : Article on "Khalifa" in shorter Encyclopaedia of Islam, London, 1953.
29. Asad, Abul Kalam, Maulana : India wins freedom, Calcutta, 1959.
30. Bahadur, Lal : The Muslim League, its history, activities and achievements, Agra, 1954.
31. Baksh, S. Khuda : Mohammad, The Prophet of God, Lahore, 1953.
32. " " " : Caliphate, Lahore, 1954.

33. Banerjee, R.C. : The story of Khilafat, Jessore, 1922.
34. Banerjee, Nirpendra Chandra : Gandhism in theory and Practice, Madras, 1923.
35. Barkat Ullah, Mohammed : The Khilafat, London, 1924.
36. Beg, Mirza Abdul Qadir : Khilafat and Jazirat-ul-arab  
English translation of the  
Presidential address delivered  
by Maulana Abul Kalam Azad at  
the Bengal Provincial Khilafat  
Committee meeting in February,  
1920, Calcutta.
37. Besant, Annie : The future of India Politics,  
Adyar, Madras, 1922.
38. " " : India, a nation, Adyar, Madras, 1930
39. " " : Gandhian Non-Co-operation or  
shall India Commit suicide?  
Madras, 1920.
40. Bihar Government  
Publication : The Non-Co-operation and Khilafat  
movement in Bihar and Orissa,  
Patna, 1925.
41. Bose, Subhash : The Indian struggle (1920-1934)  
Calcutta, 1948.
42. Bright, J.S. : The Himalyan Flunders of Mahatma  
Gandhi, Lahore, 1945.
43. Brockelmann, Carl : History of the Islamic Peoples,  
London, 1950.
44. Bury, G. Wyman : Pan Islam, London, 1919.
45. Chintamani, C.Y. : Indian Politics since the Mutiny,  
Waltair, 1937.
46. Chirol, Valentine : Pan Islamism.

47. Chirol, Valentine : India Old and New, London, 1922.
48. " " : India, London, 1926.
49. Coatsman, J. : Years of Destiny-India(1926-1932) London, 1932.
50. Cole, F. Seymour : India Should know Turkey, Bombay, 1943.
51. Coupland, R. : India, a restatement, London, 1945.
52. " " : The Indian Constitutional Problem (1833-1935) London, 1942.
53. Gunning, Sir, John : Political India (1832-1932) London, 1932.
54. Dar, Bashir, Ahmad : Religious thought of Sayed Ahmad, Lahore, 1957.
55. Das, Krishana : Seven months with Mahatma Gandhi (Being an inside view of the Indian non-Co-operation movement 1921-1922) Ahmedabad, 1951.
56. Desai, Mahadeo : Maulana Azad, Agra, 1946
57. Dhavan, G.N. : The Political Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi, Ahmedabad, 1951.
58. Divakar, R.R. : Satyagraha in action, Calcutta, 194
59. Draper : History of Intellectual Development of Europe, Vol II, London, 1891.
60. Dutt, R. Palme : India to-day, Bombay, 1947.
61. Edib, Halide : Conflict of East and West in Turkey, Delhi, 1935.
62. " " : The Turkish Ordeal, New York, 1923.
63. Edward, William : British foreign policy from 1815-1933, London, 1934.

64. Encyclopaedia Britanica : Vols.4, 12 and 22 Chicago, 1949 Edition.
65. Encyclopaedia of Islam : Vol.2, London, 1927.
66. Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences : Vol.3, New York, 1950 Edition.
67. Eversley, Lord : The Turkish Empire, abridged by Sheikh Abdur Rashid (1288-1924) Aligarh, 1952.
68. Gandhi, M.K. : The Khilafat (An address Gandhi ji delivered at the special meeting of the Anjuman Zia-ul-Islam in Bombay on July, 12, 1919 on the Khilafat issue Bombay, 1919)
69. " " " : An autobiography or the history of my experiments with Truths, Ahmedabad, 1958 Edition.
70. " " " : Communal unity, Ahmedabad, 1949.
71. " " " : Hind Swaraj; India Home Rule, Ahmedabad, 1946.
72. " " " : Freedom's battle (A comprehensive Collection of Gandhi ji's writings and speeches on Khilafat wrong, Punjab agony, Hindu Muslim unity, Non-Co-operation etc. Madras, 1922.
73. Gandhi, M.K. : My religion, Ahmedabad, 1955, Edition.
74. " " " : Young India, Vol.I, 1919-1922, Madras, 1924.
75. " " " : Young India, Vol.II, 1924-1926. Madras, 1927.
76. " " " : Young India, III, 1927-1928, Madras, 1935.



77. George, David, Llyod : Memories of the peace conference,  
New Haven (Yale University Press  
1939)
78. Gibb, H.A.R. Kramers : Shorter Encyclopaedia of Islam,  
London, 1935.
79. Gopal, Ram : Indian Muslims, - A Political  
history 1858-1947, Bombay 1959.
80. Habib Ullah, A.B.M. : The foundation of Muslim rule in  
India, Allahabad.
81. Har, Dayal : Forty four months in Germany and  
Turkey, London, 1920.
82. Hitti, Phillip, K. : History of the Arabs, London, 1946.
83. Hughes : Dictionary of Islam, article on  
"Khalifa".
84. Hunter, Sir, W.W. : The Indian Mussalmans, London 1872.
85. Husain, A. Mahdi : Bhadur Shah II and the War of 1857  
in Delhi, published by Messrs Atma  
Ram & Sons, Delhi.
86. Husain, Abid Syed : The Destiny of Indian Muslims, Asia  
Publishing House, Bombay, 1965.
87. Indian Annual Register : Calcutta, 1919 to 1923.
88. John, Forbes, Bryant : Gandhi and Indianisation of Empire  
(1914-1924) London, 1924.
89. Kabir, Humayun : Muslim Politics (1906-1942)  
Calcutta, 1943.
90. Kamal Uddin, Khawaja : India in the balance:  
British rule and the Caliphate,  
London, 1922.
91. Karim, Rezaul : For India and Islam, Calcutta, 1937.
92. Khaliquzzaman, Chaudry : 'Pathway to Pakistan, Orient  
Longmans.

93. Knight : The awakening of Turkey  
London, 1909.
94. Landon, Rom : Islam and the Arabs, Published by  
George Allen & Unwin Ltd. London.
95. Lane-poole, Stanley : The Prophet of Islam, (abridged)  
Lahore, 1952.
96. " " : Turkey, London, 1922.
97. Lipson, E. : Europe in the nineteenth century  
and twentieth century, London, 1949.
98. Mahmudi, Syed, Dr. : The Khilafat and England, Patna,  
1922.
99. Marriot, J.A.R. : The Eastern Question, Oxford, 1918.
100. Miller, William : The Ottoman Empire and its  
successors, Cambridge, 1923.
101. Mishra, D.P. : The history of freedom movements  
in Madhya Pradesh, Nagpur, 1956.
102. Mohammad, Shan : Writings and Speeches of Sir Syed  
Ahmed Khan, Bombay, 1972.
103. 1921 Movement;  
Reminiscences : Publication Division, Ministry of  
Information and Broad Casting,  
New Delhi, 1971.
104. Muir, William : Annals of the early Caliphate,  
London, 1883.
105. " " : The Caliphate, its rise, decline  
and fall. T.H. Weir, Edinburgh,  
1924.
106. Mujeeb, M. Prof. : Indian Muslims, London, 1967.
107. Mukerjee, H. : India struggles for freedom  
Bombay, 1946.
108. " " : Gandhiji a study, Calcutta, 1958.

109. Mukerjee, S. : Communalism in Muslim Politics and trouble over India, Calcutta Oriental Agency, 1947.
110. NamhooDiripad : The Mahatma and the Islam, New Delhi, 1958.
111. Natesan, G.A. : Eminent Mussalmans, Madras, 1926.
112. " " : Congress Presidential addresses, (1911 to 1934) Vol.(1) Madras, 1934.
113. " " : The Indian National Congress Presidential addresses and resolutions passed upto 1920.
114. " " : M.K.Gandhi: An Indian Patriot in South Africa, Madras, 1920.
115. Nehru, J.L. : Autobiography, London, 1936.
116. " " : The Discovery of India, London, 1956.
117. " " (edited) : The Indian National Congress 1920 to 1923. A Collection of the resolutions of the Congress from Sept. 1920 to 1923.
118. Nicolson, H. Curzon : The last phase (1918-1925) London, 1934.
119. Noman, Mohammad : Muslim India, Allahabad, 1942.
120. Nundy, Alfred : Indian unrest (1919-1920) Dehradun, 1921.
121. " " : The present situation with special reference to the Punjab disturbance Dehradun, 1919.
122. Powell, E. Alexander : The struggle for power in Muslim Asia, London, 1925.
123. Prasad, Beni, Dr. : Hindu-Muslim Questions, Lahore, 1943.
124. Prasad, Ishwari : History of Mediaeval India, from 647 A.D. to the Mughal Conquest, Allahabad, 1948.

125. Prasad, Rajendra : A brief sketch of the Non-co-operation movement. (Introduction to Young India, Vol. I).
126. " " : India Divided, Bombay, 1947.
127. " " : Autobiography, Bombay, 1957.
128. Price, Clair : The Rebirth of Turkey, New York, 1923.
129. Radha-Krishnan's : Mahatma Gandhi (Essays and Reflections) Bombay, 1957.
130. Reading, Marquess of : First Marquess of Reading 2 Vols. London, 1945.
131. Ronald Shay, Earl of : India, a bird's eye view, London, 1924.
132. " " : Life of Lord Curzon in 3 Vols, London, 1928.
133. Shakir Moin : From Khilafat to Partition, Delhi.
134. Sitaramayya, Pattabhi : The History of the Indian National Congress Vol. I (1885-1935) Bombay, 1935.
135. Smith, W.C. : Islam in Modern History New Jersey, 1957.
136. " " : Modern Islam in India, Lahore, 1947.
137. Suyuti, A.S. Jalaluddin : (History of the Caliphs) Translated from the original Arabic by Major J.S. Jarrett, Calcutta, Published by the Asiatic Society, 1881.
138. Tendulkar, D.G. : Mahatma, life of Mohan Das Karam Chand Gandhi, Vol. I & II, Delhi, 1951.
139. Thadeni : The Historical trial of the Ali Brothers and five others, Karachi, 1921.

140. Toynbee, Arnold J : The Western Questions in Greece and Turkey, London, 1922. --
141. " " : Survey of International affairs 1925; The Islamic World since the peace settlement, London, 1927
142. Toynbee and Kirkwood : Turkey(The Modern World Vol.VI,) London, 1926. --
143. Vaswani, T.L. : The spirit and struggle of Islam, Madras, 1921.
144. Webster, D.E. : The Turkey of the Ataturk, Philadelphia, 1939. --
145. Wellhausen : The rise and fall of the Arab Kingdom, University of Calcutta, 1927. ...
146. Zakaria, Rafiq Dr. : Rise of Muslim Politics, Bombay.

\*\*\*\*\*

### ABBREVIATIONS

Ibn Hajar:	Fateh Ul Bari -- F.B.
Al-Balezuri:	Futuhu Ul Buldan- Fh B.
Wali Ullah Shah:	Izalalatul Khifa-'Izala'
A. C. :	Ante Christum(= before Christ)

\*\*\*\*\*